

Cases Reported this Week.

In the Solicitors' Journal.

Daintree v. Fasulo	384
Graham v. Edge and Another	383
Jowett v. Idle Local Board	383
Parker and Others (Solicitors). Re	385
Spencer v. The Ancoats Vale	383
Rubber Co.	384
Tackett's Trustees, Re	384
West London Commercial Bank (Lim.), Re	384

In the Weekly Reporter.

Anlaby v. Proctorius	487
Arrowsmith v. Dickenson	507
Bateman v. Poplar District Board of Works	501
Beal v. Town Clerk of Exeter	507
Bentley v. Vilmont	481
Bridges v. Miller	509
Childs v. Cox	505

Gosnell v. Bishop	505
Humphrey v. Farle	510
Kaye v. Sutherland	508
Kvahe v. Alturas Gold Co	496
Liverpool Household Stores Association v. Smith	485
London Founders' Association v. Clarke	489
London Steam Dyeing Co. v. Digby	497
Mayor &c., of Bury v. Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Co.	491
McClean v. Prichard	508
"Prinz Heinrich," The	511
Reg. v. Directors of the Great Western Railway Co.	509
Republic of Peru v. Dreyfus & Co.	492
Rogers v. Drury	496
Sachs v. Spielman	498
Waite v. Worland	484
W. F. Bethell, In re, Bethell v. Hildyard	508

The Solicitors' Journal and Reporter.

LONDON, APRIL 14, 1888.

CURRENT TOPICS.

WE REGRET to learn that Lord Justice LINDLEY is again suffering from illness, and unable to attend to his duties in court. During his absence the Lord Chancellor is presiding in Court of Appeal No. I.

THE MOTION for the appointment of a new judge of the Chancery Division again appeared in the Orders of the Day of the House of Commons on Thursday, but we understand it was considered by the Attorney-General to be very doubtful whether time would allow of the motion being made. This, at all events, is clear—that the Government mean to bring the matter on for discussion.

COMPARING THE LIST of appeals in the paper for the present sittings with previous lists, it appears that the two divisions of the court have before them 195 appeals in all, whereas at the commencement of Hilary Sittings the appeals numbered 221. The principal variation is in the Chancery Appeals, which shew a total of only 44, while at the Hilary Sittings they were 73. A year ago the total number of appeals in the list was 169.

IN THE CHANCERY DIVISION the total number of cases before the five judges is 790, as against 850 at the Hilary Sittings, and 761 a year ago. The Queen's Bench cause list shews a total of 1,318 causes, as against 1,191 last sittings, and 1,158 in Easter, 1887. For the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division there is a list of 244 cases in all, as compared with 200 in the Hilary Sittings list, and 198 in that of Easter, 1887.

A STATEMENT has appeared in the daily papers, made apparently with authority, that the police who have now for some years been posted at all the entrances to the Royal Courts of Justice are shortly to be withdrawn. We venture to express a hope that this design may not be carried out. The presence of the police outside the building has served to preserve order and to keep away loiterers who would otherwise enter and create confusion and crowding in courts and passages too small for those who come on legitimate business.

THE NEW TREASURY RULE under the National Debt (Conversion) Act, 1888, which we publish elsewhere, remedies an omission in the original rules which was brought to light by the provisions of rules 15 and 18 of the Lord Chancellor's rules. It is now provided, in manner corresponding with the provisions of the above-mentioned rules with regard to stop orders and charging orders, that, as regards new stock taken in exchange for Consols or Re-

duced Threes, on which a *distringas* or other legal restraint has been placed, the concurrence of the persons by whom the restraint was lodged shall not be required.

IT WILL BE SEEN from the case of *Re Parker and Others (Solicitors)*, which we report in another column, that the Council of the Incorporated Law Society have put in train for decision by the ultimate Court of Appeal the point so often mooted since the Remuneration Order came into operation, whether the phrase of rule 11 of Schedule I., part 1—"the scale for conducting a sale by auction shall apply only in cases where no commission is paid by the client to an auctioneer"—applies to the payment by the client to the auctioneer of a lump sum. The opinions of counsel taken on this point in 1883 differed, Mr. WOLSTENHOLME considering that a fixed payment would be a commission, while Mr. COLENS-HARDY, Q.C., and Mr. (now Mr. Justice) A. L. SMITH thought that a distinction was drawn in the order between auctioneers' charges and auctioneers' commission, and that a solicitor might therefore receive the conducting fee, and charge his client with an auctioneer's charge as distinguished from an auctioneer's commission. Writing on the subject in 1883 (27 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 545), we were compelled to point out the difficulties connected with this contention, and some of which are referred to by Mr. Justice CHITTY in his judgment in the recent case. We shall rejoice to find that a different view prevails in the House of Lords, but we cannot say we are sanguine, and we do not quite understand why the council should have waited five years before testing the point. During that period the courts have had time to establish the sacred principle that the Order is never to be construed in favour of a solicitor.

THE CAUSE LISTS of the five judges of the Chancery Division contain, as printed, 469 witness actions, and the lists of Hilary Sittings contained 447 such actions. Upwards of 340 of those in the lists at the commencement of Hilary Sittings are included in the 469 contained in the list for the present sittings. It follows, that during the sixty-eight working days of the Hilary Sittings, the five judges disposed of only about 100 witness actions, and as Mr. Justice KEKEWICH alone disposed of 49, the remaining four judges only dealt with a number averaging between 12 and 13 each. Had there been another judge, who would during the same period have disposed of 50 witness actions, the remanet of 340 would have been reduced to 290. It cannot be denied that the delay of such a number of actions during the whole of a long sittings represents a considerable grievance. Opinions may differ as to the period when such a mass of business would come under the designation of arrears, but most certainly that period must have arrived with regard to the greater part of these 340 remanets. The question whether there is work in the Chancery Division for another judge is not difficult to answer.

A WRITER in the *Scotsman*, who professes to state the view of the Inland Revenue authorities, discusses the subject of the mode in which income tax should be deducted from payments becoming due during the next few months. The tax for the year to the 5th of April last was, of course, at the rate of sevenpence in the pound; and from the 5th of April the rate is to be sixpence in the pound. According to the writer, the principle on which the deduction should be made is that such tax should be deducted as was current in the period during which the income was accruing. Now dividends or interest coming from outside the United Kingdom are considered to accrue at the time they are paid here, and are, therefore, liable to the tax in force at the time of such payment. Hence duty at the rate of sixpence in the pound should be deducted from interest on foreign loans and interest and dividends from foreign or colonial companies (e.g., a colonial bank with a deposit agency in England). The same rule is stated to apply to dividends from the public funds of the United Kingdom and to official salaries and pensions. But in the case of interest on mortgages and dividends or interest from public companies in the United Kingdom, income tax should be deducted at the rate or rates in force during the period in which they have been accruing; hence the deduction in these cases should be at the rate of seven-

pence in the pound to the 5th of April last, and sixpence in the pound thereafter. We suspect that the rule thus laid down as to the mode of deduction of income tax from interest on mortgages is not very generally adopted; and the difficulty of the calculations involved in it is, in the case of half-yearly payments, slightly increased by the fact that this is leap year.

ONE RESULT of the passing of the Local Government Bill will be to add very considerably to the duties of the clerk of the peace. He is to be the clerk of the county council (clause 82), and as such will have to see to the discharge of the multifarious functions proposed to be conferred on that corporate body. When it is considered that these duties are to be added to his existing function of clerk to the Court of Quarter Sessions and his other functions under the Juries Act, 1862, the Acts relating to the registration of Parliamentary voters, and the Acts relating to the deposit and custody of plans, it will be seen that in many counties the clerk of the peace will, in the matter of duties, become a gigantic pluralist; and it is to be presumed that, in point of emolument, the office will be one of the best in the county. The Bill, of course (clause 117), constitutes the existing clerks of the peace clerks of the county councils, and provides that they shall hold their offices by the same tenure, and have the same power of acting by deputy, as heretofore; but it does not seem to have been much observed that, as regards future clerks of the peace, it is proposed to effect an important alteration in the appointment and removal of these officers. Clause 82 provides that the clerk of the peace "shall be from time to time appointed by the standing joint committee of the county council and the quarter sessions, and may be removed by that joint committee." Hitherto, of course, the county clerk of the peace has been usually appointed by the Lord-Lieutenant, and the removal of a clerk of the peace has been regulated by 1 W. & M. c. 21, as to misconduct in the execution of his office, and by 27 & 28 Vict. c. 65 as to misconduct otherwise than in the execution of his office. In both cases the removal must be after due examination and proof in open court; and under the last-mentioned statute the clerk of the peace has an appeal to the Lord Chancellor. Under the Bill the power of removal is apparently to be left to the discretion of the joint committee.

WE HAVE BEEN a good deal puzzled by the recent case of *Friend v. Shaw* (36 W. R. 236, 26 Q. B. D. 374). By section 50 of the County Courts Act, 1856 a special jurisdiction is given to county courts to order possession of premises of a certain small value held over by tenants whose term and interest shall have expired, or shall have been determined either by the landlord or the tenant by a legal notice to quit—the section being partly taken from the still unrepealed section 213 of the Common Law Procedure Act, 1852, which was itself a substantial reproduction of section 1 of 1 Geo. 4, c. 87, upon the meaning of "regular notice to quit" in which had been decided *Doe d. Tindal v. Roe* (2 B. & Ad. 922), and *Doe d. Cundey v. Sharpley* (15 M. & W. 558), the former case being to the effect that a surrender was not within the statute, and the latter to the effect that a re-entry for a forfeiture was not. In *Friend v. Shaw* the tenancy was for three years at a monthly rent, under an agreement containing a proviso for re-entry on non-payment of rent or breach of certain stipulations, one of them being that the tenant should not alter the demised premises without the licence in writing of the landlord. The landlord is stated to have given "notice to quit, alleging as breaches" an alteration of the premises without licence, and non-payment of rent; which must mean either that he served a notice under the Conveyancing Act, or merely intimated his intention of putting the proviso for re-entry in force. However this may be, the tenant refused to quit, the landlord sued under section 50 of the County Courts Act, 1856, the county court judge held that he had jurisdiction, and gave judgment for the landlord, and WILLS and GRANTHAM, JJ., have reversed this judgment on appeal, on the ground that the county court had no jurisdiction. We take the judgment to be right on the authority of *Doe d. Cundey v. Sharpley* and upon the obvious construction of the Statute. A notice that a landlord intends to take advantage of a

proviso for re-entry is not a notice to quit in the ordinary legal sense of the term. But the court at some length laid it down that the "legal notice to quit," mentioned in section 50, means the notice implied by law as necessary, and does not include any notice expressly stipulated for. This doctrine is surely incorrect. *Barlow v. Teal* (34 W. R. 54), upon which it is mainly based, proceeded upon a statute having a different object, and not even containing the expression (except as a heading) "notice to quit," much less "legal notice to quit," but only "notice"—necessary for determination of tenancy. It simply decided that section 33 of the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1883, in speaking of a notice "by law necessary" contemplates a notice necessary by implication of law. How a notice expressly stipulated for can be any less "legal" under section 50 of the County Courts Act, 1856, than a notice only impliedly necessary, we fail to conceive.

THE CITY OF LONDON Fire Inquests Bill, which, the preamble having been declared proved, will probably become law this session, is, though a private Bill, of great practical importance, inasmuch as the precedent set by it is likely to be followed in other places. The Bill directs a coroner's inquest to be held in case of loss or injury by fire within the City of London, if either the Lord Mayor, the Lord Chief Justice of England, or a Secretary of State so order, or "if the coroner for the said City be of opinion that proper cause for such an inquiry exists." The jurisdiction of the coroner and all proceedings at the inquest are to be the same as in the case of an inquest upon view of a dead body, and if it appear that there be "ground for believing that the fire was caused or aggravated by the wilful or unlawful act or default of any person known or unknown," the jury may find a verdict of arson against such person "in order that he may be placed on his trial for such offence, and such verdict and inquisition shall have the effect of an indictment." But it is provided that if any person against whom such verdict may have been found shall not have been present at the inquest, "he shall be taken before a magistrate as an accused person to answer such charge"—a very sensible provision, which ought to be made part of the general law of Coroner. We observe that the preamble declares it to be doubtful whether the coroner for the City still has the power of holding fire inquests when death has not been caused. London, no doubt, is one of the places mentioned in *Reg. v. Hertford* (29 L. J. Q. B. 249), in which such "fire inquests" were held before the judgment in that case pronounced them to be illegal; but all doubt, if any, on the subject has been removed by section 44 of the Coroners Act, 1887, which enacts, without any saving for the City, that "a coroner shall not hold inquests . . . of felonies except felonies on inquisitions of death," and we marvel greatly at the ignorance of this enactment displayed by the recently "proved" preamble of this otherwise excellent little Bill. It will be observed that the Bill considerably extends the provisions as to inquests on fires contained in the Bill to amend the Coroners Act, recently introduced by the Lord Chancellor.

Mr. Alexander Glen, barrister, has published a very convenient and well-compiled Index to the Local Government Bills, 1888 (Knight & Co.), which will be found of much service by those interested in the discussion of these measures.

The County Courts Consolidation Bill was on the 5th inst. ordered to be referred to the Standing Committee of the House of Commons on Law, Justice, and Legal Procedure.

We are informed that the case of *Colquhoun v. Brooks* (36 W. R. 332), on which we commented last week (*ante*, p. 366), has been appealed and argued on appeal, when judgment was reserved.

A recent incident in the court of a certain judge of the Chancery Division:—LEARNED JUDGE (irritably): "Really, Mr. X—, I can teach you law, but I'm afraid I cannot teach you manners." MR. X— (pausing): "—Er—no, my Lord, I'm afraid you cannot."

On the 9th inst., in the House of Commons, Sir R. Lethbridge asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the new duty of 10s. per cent. on the transfer of stocks would apply to trust funds whenever transfers take place on a new trustee being appointed and the transfer to new owners was nominal only, such transfers being at present exempt under section 78 of the Stamp Duties Act, 1870. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said that the duty on the transfer of stocks will not apply to any transfer of stocks where there is not a real sale and purchase. The merely formal transfers necessitated by the appointment of a new trustee will be exempt from stamp duty, as they are at present.

A NOVEL EXPERIMENT IN LITIGATION.

It must often happen that a person is liable to have a claim made against him at law, while, at the same time, he has a complete defence to such claim if an action should be brought to enforce it. The question arises whether and under what circumstances a person so situated can take the initiative by proceedings in equity, so as to obtain an immediate adjudication on the matters on which such claim might be made? Can he obtain immediate relief in the nature of a declaration that the claim would not be binding upon him, or must he wait until the other party seeks to enforce such claim against him, and then make good his case by way of defence?

The question is, no doubt, a wide one, but it is capable of being easily reduced to the point which came under discussion in the case of *Brooking v. Maudslay* (ante, p. 370). We may dismiss at once the case of possible claims in actions for tort; no one, of course, would suggest that, because a person was liable to have a claim made against him for tort, he should be entitled, as plaintiff, to obtain a decision in anticipation of such claim on the ground that he had a good defence; if that were so it would be open to a railway company, *prima facie* liable for negligence, to commence proceedings for the purpose of establishing a case of contributory negligence, or for the possible infringer of a patent to sue the patentee on the ground that he could shew that the defendant's patent was invalid. Coming to the cases of possible claims on contracts, we may eliminate all those cases where relief is given to a plaintiff in equity on such well-known grounds as fraud, misrepresentation, mistake, and undue influence. A person *prima facie* liable in contract is always entitled to initiate proceedings on such grounds, although no claim on the contract in question be as yet made or even threatened; but the truth is, that in these cases the plaintiff has something more than a mere defence to an action at law; the circumstances on which he relies go to the very formation and existence of the contract, and according to these circumstances he obtains original relief, even though it be sometimes (as in the case of mistake) in the nature of an indulgence, for which he will have to pay the cost.

But, assuming the existence of a valid contract unimpeachable as regards any circumstances attending its formation, and assuming that the party *prima facie* chargeable on it has a good defence to any action which may be brought, can he call on the other party to disclaim an intention of suing him, or, failing this, can he obtain a declaration that he is not liable? The question brings us to the case under discussion.

The plaintiff in the case of *Brooking v. Maudslay* was an underwriter suing on behalf of himself and other the underwriters of a policy of marine insurance; the defendants were the insurers. The property insured was machinery to be carried by the steamship *Elephant* from London to Portsmouth; there was a total loss. The underwriters had a good defence to any action on the policy—namely, the unseaworthiness of the vessel; this was admitted by the insurers, but the underwriters desired to obtain a judicial decision to this effect. Their action was commenced in the first instance for cancellation of the policy on the ground of misrepresentation, but, the circumstances not warranting such a case, they amended their claim by asking alternatively for a declaration that they were discharged from all liability, and for an injunction to restrain the insurers from taking any proceedings on the policy. This alternative claim became the real claim in the action, the former being abandoned. The defendants admitted that the plaintiffs had a good defence to any action at law on the policy, but they said that they had never threatened to bring any such action; at the same time they declined to give any undertaking to the effect that they would not bring one.

The plaintiffs contended that they were entitled to the relief asked, inasmuch as, on the face of the policy, they were liable for the amount insured, and inasmuch as their exemption from liability depended upon extrinsic circumstances which might not always be proveable. They were, however, unable to produce any precedent for such an action. In the result Mr. Justice Stirling dismissed the action, with costs.

There appears to be but little authority on the point raised. The cases cited by the plaintiffs (*Hoare v. Bremridge*, 8 Ch. 22; *Bromley v. Holland*, 5 Ves. 610; and *Simpson v. Houghton*, 3 My. & Cr. 97) were cases in which the contract or instrument

itself was impeached; as characterized by Mr. Justice Stirling in his judgment, the action was in the nature of an experiment; the learned judge said that, if the plaintiff's argument was well founded, any person liable to have a claim made against him at law, and having a good defence to it, might bring the matter before a court of equity in the same way as the plaintiffs did. Quoting the words of Lord Campbell (*Cooper v. Joel*, 1 De G. F. & J. 240), he added, "If that was the rule, hardly any dispute could arise upon a contract which might not be drawn into a court of equity."

If the plaintiffs had succeeded, it is easy to see that the door would have been opened to the litigation of numerous cases on which a claim might never have been raised at all. Suppose, for instance, the case of a policy of insurance against death from accidental injury, with a proviso that the insurance should not extend to certain specified kinds of injury: the assured dies from accidental injuries under circumstances which, according to the insurance company's contention, conclusively shewed that the accident was within the excepted risk; the executors lodge a claim, which is disputed, and they then do not think fit to sue on the policy. Why should the executors be liable to an action at the hands of the insurance company for a declaration that the company is not liable on the policy, or why should the executors be called on to give an undertaking?

It may be urged that relief should be granted on the terms of the plaintiff paying the costs, as for an indulgence. We think, however, that such a precedent would be a bad one, at any rate, where the plaintiff is unable to shew that its refusal might really result in an injury to himself. Thus the case might be different if the contract in question were a negotiable instrument. But in such a case as was presented in *Brooking v. Maudslay*, we can see no reason why a plaintiff should have the indulgence asked for, even on terms of paying the defendant's costs.

THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BILL.

THE Local Government Bill may be briefly, and would be, perhaps, best, described as a Bill to extend the Municipal Corporations Act, 1882, and to apply that Act, as amended, to such parts of the country as are not comprised within the area of any municipal borough. This purpose is carried out by the creation of (1) county councils and (2) district councils, both to be wholly elective upon a franchise similar to that existing in municipal boroughs, thus substituting everywhere the same "one man one vote" elective government for the government of justices of the peace in rural districts, whose jurisdiction in this respect is to be transferred to the county councils, and for the plural elective government of local boards in local government districts, the jurisdiction of which local boards is to be transferred to the district councils. We propose shortly to describe the character of the jurisdiction and powers which it is proposed by the Bill to transfer to these two councils respectively, which are to be, to a great extent, independent bodies. This independence, we may remark, is a very important feature of the Bill, and, if it were proposed to make the councils of municipal boroughs (which are to become district councils under clause 42) subject in any substantial degree to the county councils, there is no doubt that great, and, in our opinion, very proper, opposition to the Bill would be widely aroused.

And, first, as to the county councils, the jurisdiction of which will be far more important than that of district councils, a distinction must be drawn (see clause 8) between (1) the powers which will be transferred by the Bill itself and (2) the powers which may (or may not) be transferred by Order in Council under the Bill. Powers under the first category, though numerous and complicated, are at any rate ascertainable with comparative ease, and have already been, and are now, locally exercised. The powers under the second category are known to few, and have always been hitherto, and still are, exercised centrally by some Government office in London. This second class of powers we may as well dismiss at once in as few words as possible, and perhaps the words of the Bill itself are the best:—

"It shall be lawful for her Majesty . . . if satisfied of such approval as is hereinafter mentioned . . . from time to time by Order to transfer to the council of a county such powers . . . of her Majesty's

Privy Council, a Secretary of State, the Board of Trade, the Local Government Board, or the Education Department, or any other Government Department, as are conferred by or in pursuance of any statute and appear to her Majesty to relate to matters arising within the county, and to be of an administrative character Provided that before any such order is made, the draft thereof, approved by the Secretary of State, Board, or Department concerned whose powers, duties, and liabilities are affected thereby, shall be laid before each House of Parliament for not less than thirty days," &c.

We doubt whether the Government Departments "concerned" will be ready to approve drafts of the character suggested, but the plan, if thoroughly carried out, would result in complete decentralization of the main parts of government. Let us now see what are to be the powers of the county councils, to be derived directly from the Bill.

General powers now locally exercised.—The transfer of these powers is mainly effected by clause 3, which, after a transfer by general words of "the administrative business of the justices of the county in quarter sessions assembled," proceeds to catalogue such business in sixteen sub-clauses, which comprise (omitting very minor matters) (1) the making of county, police, hundred, or other rate; (2) borrowing; (3) control of the county treasurer; (4) control of assize courts and other county buildings; (5) music hall licensing; (6) hearing of appeals as to licences of gangmasters and pawnbrokers' certificates; (7) management of pauper lunatic asylums; (8) management of reformatory and industrial schools; (9) control of bridges; (10)–(12) control and settlement of fees or salaries of analysts, inspectors, and other officials; (13) allotment of polling districts; (14) execution of Cattle Plague Act, Wild Birds Act, and Weights and Measures Act; (15) registration of the rules of scientific societies and of charitable gifts, and certifying of places of religious worship; and (16) "any other business transferred by this Act." We think that all the "other" rates included in paragraph 1 should be particularly mentioned, and the "other business" transferred by paragraph 16 should be more particularly described in clause 3 itself. We may remark in passing that the making of poor rates, not being the work of justices in quarter sessions, is not comprehended in clause 3, and that clause 5 expressly saves to quarter sessions their present business "in relation to the preparation or revision of a basis or standard for the county rate and in relation to appeals by any overseers or persons against that or any other rate." By clause 4 there is also to be transferred the business of county justices out of sessions as to licensing of theatres and the execution of the Explosives Act, and by clause 7 a standing joint committee of the quarter sessions and the county council is to have all the powers (with one or two exceptions) now vested solely in quarter sessions in relation to the police.

General powers now not locally exercised.—A schedule in three parts enumerates a long series of powers now vested by statute in a Secretary of State, the Board of Trade, and the Local Government Board respectively, and clause 8, paragraph 1, transfers these powers, so far as they arise within a county, to the council of that county, "subject nevertheless to the exceptions and modifications in the said schedule mentioned," adding the important provision that, "where any such power arises within two or more counties, the same shall be transferred to the county councils of such counties jointly, and may be exercised by a joint committee of such councils." The schedule occupies six pages of the Bill, and gives the statute whence the power proposed to be transferred is derived, with—in some cases, and in some only—an abstract of the effect of the enactment creating the power. Amongst the more important of the powers in question are those of a Secretary of State to approve new burial-grounds under the Burial Act, 1853 (16 & 17 Vict. c. 134), s. 6, and to abolish fairs under the Fairs Act, 1871 (34 & 35 Vict. c. 12), s. 3; the powers of the Board of Trade, under the Tramways Act, 1870, and Electric Lighting Act, 1882, to make provisional orders, bye-laws, and regulations (a transfer very nearly akin to the actual delegation of the powers of Parliament itself); and the powers of the Local Government Board under very numerous enactments of the Public Health Act and other Acts, of which may be mentioned as specimens the consent to letting of lands by local authority under section 177 of the Public Health Act, the power to require a local authority to provide a cemetery under the Public Health (Interments) Act, 1879, and the power to appoint and remove an arbitrator to settle compensation to owner of premises under section 7 of the Artizans and Labourers' Dwellings Act (1868) Amendment Act, 1879.

Special licensing powers.—The powers of the licensing justices under the Licensing Acts to license places for the sale of intoxicating liquors are transferred to the county councils with substantial and important amendments of the law of licensing itself, and there is also an entirely new power given (see clause 9) to make, rescind, and vary regulations for entire or modified Sunday closing, either in the whole county of the council making the regulation, or in any specified part of the county. The provisions of clauses 10 to 14 inclusive, which create a new law of licensing, are of a most complicated and involved character. All the powers of quarter sessions, or any committee thereof, or county justices out of sessions are to be transferred to the county council, and all powers now exercised by quarter sessions or any committee thereof are to be vested in the council, while all powers of justices out of sessions (e.g., the power to grant temporary transfers and to consent to the grant of occasional licences) are to be vested in the licensing committee of one of the "licensing divisions," each to comprise "a group of electoral divisions returning in the aggregate not less than six elective county councillors," into which each county is to be divided by the county council from time to time, "provided that the county council in so dividing their county shall constitute every such borough or other district as had, according to the census of 1881, a population of 50,000 or upwards, a separate licensing division."

The following clause (11) deals with the important question of renewal:—

"On an application being made to a licensing committee to renew a licence for the sale of any intoxicating liquor, the committee shall, if it is a case in which they are required to do so by this Act, refuse the renewal of the licence, and in any other case may, as in their absolute discretion they think fit, either grant the renewal of the licence or refuse the same, whether with a view to diminish the number of licensed premises in the division, or with any other object whatever, subject, nevertheless, to such confirmation by the county council and to such compensation as is provided by this Act."

The scheme of the subsequent clauses is to make it obligatory upon the licensing committee to refuse a renewal upon a report by justices in petty sessions of disqualification of a licence holder, or of the deciding against him of an application by "a person" hostile to the licence holder "on any ground on which, if this Act had not passed, justices would have been authorized or required" to refuse the renewal; and discretionary on the part of the county council to affirm or disaffirm the refusal of a renewal upon grounds other than those affecting the character of the licence holder or his house. Where the refusal is affirmed, compensation is to be paid after assessment (clause 13, sub-clause 3) "on the basis of the difference, if any, between the value of the licensed premises immediately before the passing of this Act and the value which such premises would have then borne if the licence had then determined."

Special powers other than licensing powers.—These are, shortly, the powers of a highway board over main roads (clause 15) the power of enforcing the Rivers Pollution Prevention Act, 1876, which the county council is to have in addition to and not instead of any other authority, and the same power of making byelaws in relation to their county as a municipal borough has, under section 23 of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1882, in relation to their borough—viz., to make such byelaws as to them seem meet for the good rule and government "of the county, and for prevention and suppression of nuisances not already punishable in a summary manner by virtue of any Act in force throughout the county"—an enactment taken from section 90 of the Municipal Corporations Act of 1835, and needing, in our opinion, much expansion in terms before it can be fittingly incorporated in a county government Act of 1888.

Financial powers.—In addition to the borrowing powers transferred, as already mentioned, from quarter sessions, and to new borrowing powers of an extensive character under clause 66, which latter powers will require the consent of the Local Government Board for their exercise, the county councils are (clause 18) to have the power to levy, and also to increase by twenty per cent., the liquor licensing duties, and to levy the duties on licences to deal in game. They will also have the functions of recovering all penalties under any Inland Revenue Act for the non-payment of these duties, including the power to remit penalties. It is not expressly said whether the existing powers of the Inland Revenue, in relation to the same duties, are to cease, and we think

that such provision ought to be expressly made, as it would be extremely inconvenient for the Inland Revenue to exercise a concurrent jurisdiction with the county councils in these matters. They will also have transferred to them a proportion of the probate duties, and all the proceeds of the duties upon such licences of liquor retailers for the grant of which no justice's licence is now required, and upon game-killing, tobacco, gun, dog, and other licences, termed as a class "local taxation licences." These duties, together with the duties on the licences for the grant of which the justice's licence is now required, are together to form a fund which, under the limited superintendence of the Local Government Board, the county councils are to distribute in aid of the relief of the poor and other local objects. Moreover, an Order in Council may transfer the power of levying and recovering, but not increasing, all the "local taxation licences."

District councils.—The district councils are to be either urban or rural, and, speaking generally, every existing urban sanitary district is to be an urban district, and every existing rural sanitary district is to be a rural district under the Act. By clause 42, "where a county district is a borough, the council of the borough, consisting of the mayor, aldermen, and councillors, shall be the council of the district, and shall retain its existing name," and as all boroughs are urban sanitary districts under the Public Health Act, 1875, this provision is of vital importance to the municipal interest. Nor do the municipal boroughs gain much accession of powers. Clause 48, however, transfers to all district councils the powers of justices out of session as to the licensing of gamblers, pawnbrokers, game-dealers, hawkers, passage-brokers, and emigrant-runners, and as to appeals from police as to certificates for pedlars, abolition of fairs, and "the execution as the local authority of the Acts relating to petroleum, infant life protection, or dogs," and also the powers of quarter sessions as to the licensing of slaughter-houses. If the district is not a borough, its district council will take over all the powers of the improvement commissioners, local board, or rural sanitary authority, as the case may be, and there will also be transferred (clause 46) to the district council of each rural district all the powers of the highway board, and "every highway board, surveyor of highways, or district surveyor shall cease to hold office or to be elected." There will also be transferred to every district council (clause 47) the powers of any authority acting within the district of such council of the Lighting and Watching Act, the Baths and Washhouses Acts, the Labouring Classes Lodging Houses Acts, the Public Libraries Act, the Burial Acts, and the Public Improvement Act, 1860, "save where such powers are otherwise than under this Act vested in the district council of that district." There is, by clause 72, a power given to district councils to borrow, with the consent of the Local Government Board, for (1) any purpose for which any authority whose powers are by this Act transferred to the council are authorized by any general Act to borrow, and (2) the purposes of any Act [e.g., the Public Libraries Act] which, if adopted, is directed by this Act to be executed by the district council, and (3) the consolidation of debts.

CORRESPONDENCE.

A BORROWED AND DISFIGURED ANECDOTE.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—In your issue of the 31st of March last is the following paragraph:—

An American legal journal ascribes to "Mr. Justice Bramwell" the following lucid directions to a witness:—"My good woman," he would say to a witness, "you must give an answer, in the fewest possible words of which you are capable, to the plain and simple question whether, when you were crossing the street with the baby in your arms, and the omnibus was coming down on the right side and the cab on the left side, and the brougham was trying to pass the omnibus, you saw the plaintiff between the brougham and the cab, or whether and when you saw him at all, and whether or not near the brougham, cab, or omnibus, or either or any two, and which of them respectively—or how was it?"

The passage has gone across the Atlantic and come back disguised. The directions referred to are taken from a book published by us called "A Generation of Judges," and are not put into the mouth of "Mr. Justice Bramwell," Baron Bramwell, or Lord Bramwell, but of their rightful owner, the late Lord Chief Baron Kelly, in his biography in that book.

Some reparation seems due to the disfigured passage, and, as it has been brought to our knowledge that extracts from this book, with and without acknowledgment, are afloat in the periodical press on both sides of the Atlantic, we take the liberty of forwarding you a copy of the book, the second edition of which is just out.

SAMPSON LOW, MARSTON, SEARLE, & RIVINGTON (LIMITED).
St. Dunstan's House, Fetter-lane, E.C.

CASES OF THE WEEK.

COURT OF APPEAL.

GRAHAM v. EDGE AND ANOTHER—No. 1, 10th April.

UNREGISTERED COMPANY—ACTION AGAINST OFFICIAL LIQUIDATOR—RIGHT TO STAY—COMPANIES ACT, 1862 (25 & 26 VICT. c. 89), ss. 87, 203.

This was an appeal from the decision of a divisional court (Huddleston, B., and Manisty, J.), reported 20 Q. B. D. 538. The action was brought to recover arrears of ground-rent charged on property which had been conveyed by the plaintiff in 1872 to certain persons, from whom it had passed to the trustees of the Blackburn Benefit Building Society, which was an unregistered company. In 1881 an order of the court was made for winding up the building society under the provisions of the Companies Act, 1862, relating to unregistered companies. On February 21, 1882, by another order all the property of the company, including the land on which was this ground-rent, was vested in the defendants as official liquidators under section 203 of the Companies Act, 1862. The defendants continued to pay the ground-rent till 1885, when they ceased to do so. The action having been brought without leave of the court in the winding-up proceedings, application was made to stay it under section 85 of the Companies Act, 1862, by which "when an order has been made for the winding up of a company under this Act, no suit, action, or other proceeding shall be proceeded with or commenced against the company except with the leave of the court." The application having been referred by Hawkins, J., at chambers to the Divisional Court, the action was stayed by them. The plaintiff appealed, contending that the action was against the liquidators personally, and not against the building society.

THE COURT (Lord Esher, M.R., and Bowen, L.J.) dismissed the appeal. They said that by section 203 the property of the company vested in the official liquidators by their official names, and they in their official names might bring or defend any actions relating to the property so vested in them. This action had been launched against them in their individual personal capacity, and not in their official capacity. They were servants of the court appointed to assist the court in the winding up, and it was clear that they were not liable in their personal capacity. The action must, therefore, be stayed as frivolous and vexatious. Whether, if the action was brought against them in their official capacity, the leave of the court would be necessary, was a question which it was now unnecessary to decide.—COUNSEL, T. W. Chittie; Ralph Neville, Q.C., and Joseph Walton. SOLICITORS, Pritchard, Englefield, & Co.; Needham.

JOWETT v. IDLE LOCAL BOARD—No. 1, 10th April.

PUBLIC HEALTH ACT, 1875 (38 & 39 VICT. c. 55), ss. 4, 150—"STREET."

This was an appeal by the plaintiff from the decision of a divisional court (Stephen and Charles, JJ.), reported 36 W. R. 138.

The action was brought for trespass against the local board for entering upon certain premises known as Union-yard, in the township of Idle, for the purpose of paving the centre of the yard as a roadway under section 150 of the Public Health Act, 1875. Union-yard was a kind of irregular square, having formerly been a farm-yard. It had cottages on either side of it, and at the head of the yard was a mill, the gates of which opened into the yard. The yard was chiefly used by persons going to and from the mill. The action was tried by Manisty, J., who left to the jury the question whether Union-yard was a street or not, and the jury found that, under the exceptional surroundings, it did not come within the meaning of the word "street." The Divisional Court held that the question was one of law for the judge, and considered themselves bound by the decision in *The Mayor of Portsmouth v. Smith* (10 App. Cas. 361), that section 4—the interpretation clause—must be read with section 150 of the Public Health Act. By section 4 "street" includes (*inter alia*) "any alley or passage, whether a thoroughfare or not." It was now contended that the opinion expressed by the Court of Appeal in the *Portsmouth* case was not necessary to the decision, and that it had been doubted in the House of Lords when the decision of the Court of Appeal was affirmed.

THE COURT (Lord Esher, M.R., and Bowen, L.J.) dismissed the appeal. Lord Esher, M.R., said that he was still of the same opinion as he was in the *Portsmouth* case, that section 4 must be read with the other sections as shewing what a street was. The House of Lords had not expressly overruled that opinion; they had only said that they were not prepared at present to concur with it. The Court of Appeal were not, therefore, bound to withdraw their opinion, and the plaintiff's only course was to ask the House of Lords for a definite decision. BOWEN, L.J., concurred.—COUNSEL, Tindal Atkinson, Q.C., and Longstaffe; Forbes, Q.C., and Wilberforce. SOLICITORS, Lancaster & Wright, Bradford; Killick, Hunter, & Vint, Bradford.

SPENCER v. THE ANCOATS VALE RUBBER CO.—No. 2, 10th April.

R. S. C., 1883, LVIII., 4—APPEAL—FURTHER EVIDENCE—LEAVE OF COURT—INTERLOCUTORY APPLICATION—CROSS-EXAMINATION.

This was an appeal from the refusal of North, J., to issue a writ of

sequestration against the defendant company for an alleged breach of an injunction. The action was brought to restrain the defendants from infringing a patent of the plaintiff for buffers to railway carriages. The defendants consented to a judgment for a perpetual injunction, with a proviso that the injunction was not to prevent the defendants from making buffers according to an earlier patent of the plaintiff. The plaintiff afterwards moved for a sequestration against the defendants, alleging that they committed a breach of the injunction by making buffers in part according to the later patent. On the evidence before him, North, J., declined to issue the sequestration. The plaintiff gave notice of appeal, and also gave notice to the defendants that he intended, on the hearing of the appeal, to use some further affidavits, of which he sent copies to the defendants. The defendants did not state that they wished to answer this evidence or to cross-examine the plaintiff's witnesses, but said that they should object that the plaintiff was not entitled to adduce fresh evidence without the leave of the court. Rule 4 of order 58 provides that the Court of Appeal shall have "full discretionary power to receive further evidence upon questions of fact, such evidence to be either by oral examination in court, by affidavit, or by deposition taken before an examiner or commissioner. Such further evidence may be given without special leave upon interlocutory applications, or, in any case, as to matters which have occurred after the date of the decision from which the appeal is brought. Upon appeals from a judgment after trial or hearing of any cause or matter upon the merits, such further evidence (save as to matters subsequent as aforesaid) shall be admitted on special grounds only, and not without special leave of the court." On the opening of the appeal the appellant proposed to use the new evidence, and it was objected, on behalf of the defendants, that the order appealed from was not an interlocutory one, but that it finally determined between the parties the real question in dispute—viz., whether the articles which the defendants manufactured were an infringement of the plaintiff's later patent, and that, consequently, the latter part of the rule applied, and new evidence could not be adduced without the special leave of the court. *Re The Stockton Iron Furnace Co.* (10 Ch. D. 335) and *Re Compton, Norton v. Compton* (28 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 671, 27 Ch. D. 392) were cited. At any rate, it was urged, the defendants ought to be allowed to cross-examine the plaintiff's witnesses and to adduce fresh evidence of their own in answer.

THE COURT (COTTON, FRY, and LOPES, L.JJ.) held that the order appealed from was an interlocutory one within the meaning of rule 4, and that the appellant was therefore entitled to adduce further evidence without special leave. But, as the parties had chosen to adopt a somewhat unusual mode for determining the question whether the defendants' articles were an infringement of the plaintiff's later patent, the defendants ought to have an opportunity of filing further affidavits, and the plaintiff should be allowed to reply, and both parties should have an opportunity of cross-examining the witnesses of the other side. But the court did not intend to lay down that, whenever fresh affidavits were filed on an appeal from an interlocutory order, there was a right of cross-examination; they only thought that, under the peculiar circumstances of the present case, an opportunity of cross-examination should be allowed.—COUNSEL, *Sir R. E. Webster, A.G., Moulton, Q.C., and P. L. Dove; Cozens-Hardy, Q.C., and Chadwyck-Healey; O. Leigh Clare.* SOLICITORS, *F. J. Abbott; Grundy, Kershaw, & Co.*

DAINTREE v. FASULO—No. 2, 11th April.

WILL—EXECUTION—ATTESTATION—ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF TESTATOR'S SIGNATURE—WILLS ACT (7 WILL 4 & 1 VICT. C. 26) s. 9.

This was an appeal from a decision of Butt, J., the question being whether the signature of a testatrix to a codicil to her will had been sufficiently acknowledged by her in the presence of the attesting witnesses. Section 9 of the Wills Act provides that a will shall be signed "by the testator, or by some other person in his presence and by his direction; and such signature shall be made or acknowledged by the testator in the presence of two or more witnesses present at the same time, and such witnesses shall attest and shall subscribe the will in the presence of the testator." In the present case the testatrix was on the 18th of March, 1886, staying in the house of a Miss Hepburn, and she said to Miss Hepburn, "I have got something which requires two witnesses. Will you sign it, and get your servant to sign it?" Miss Hepburn said she would herself sign it, and would get Miss Whympier, a lady who lived next door, to sign also. Afterwards Miss Whympier came, and she and Miss Hepburn went into the dining-room. The testatrix then produced a paper, and was about to say something with reference to it, when Miss Hepburn said, "I would rather not know what it is." Upon this the testatrix was silent, and Miss Hepburn and Miss Whympier signed the document, the word "witnesses" preceding their names. At the trial they both identified the codicil as the document which they had signed. Neither of them had any recollection of having seen the testatrix affix her signature to the document, but Miss Hepburn recollected seeing the signature of the testatrix on the paper, and Miss Whympier thought she saw it at the time the paper was attested. Miss Whympier remembered being asked into the room to sign her name to the paper, but she did not recollect whether that request was made to her by Miss Hepburn or by the testatrix. Both the witnesses said that when signing as attesting witnesses they did not know that they were attesting a testamentary paper. Butt, J., held that there had been a sufficient acknowledgment by the testatrix of her signature, and that the codicil was a valid testamentary instrument.

THE COURT (COTTON, FRY, and LOPES, L.JJ.) affirmed the decision. COTTON, L.J., said that it was not disputed that the signature of the testatrix was on the document in question, nor that her signature was there when the witnesses came into the room. They put their names to

the document as witnesses, and the signature of the testatrix was in such a position that they could have seen it. The evidence of Miss Whympier shewed that she knew she was signing as a witness. On the evidence, the proper conclusion was that, after Miss Whympier came into the room in which the testatrix and Miss Hepburn were, either the testatrix or Miss Hepburn asked Miss Whympier to sign as a witness. It was admitted law that it was not necessary for a testator, in order to acknowledge his signature, to say "This is my signature;" it was sufficient if he did some act recognizing the signature as his. In the present case his lordship thought it was a sufficient acknowledgment of the signature when the testatrix put the paper, which had her signature on it, before two persons who had been already asked to sign it as witnesses, and who, even if they did not actually see her signature, had every opportunity of doing so. In *In the Goods of Thompson* (4 Notes of Cases, 643), under similar circumstances, Sir Herbert Jenner Fust held that there had been a sufficient acknowledgment. His lordship did not think that case had been overruled by *Holt v. Genge* (4 Moore P. C. 265). The facts of the latter case were very different. If the signature of the testator was on the paper when the witnesses were called in, the paper was so folded that they could not have seen it. It had been argued that the judgment of the Lord Chancellor in that case had laid down a principle inconsistent with *In the Goods of Thompson*. But the expressions used by a judge must be taken in connection with the facts of the case before him. *Pearson v. Pearson* (2 P. & M. 451) was said to be inconsistent with *In the Goods of Thompson*; but there were other circumstances in *Pearson v. Pearson* which prevented the acknowledgment from being sufficient. Lord Penzance did not there profess to overrule *In the Goods of Thompson*, though he thought the judgment of the Lord Chancellor in *Holt v. Genge* inconsistent with it. That expression of opinion ought not to prevent this court from acting upon *In the Goods of Thompson*. In *Blake v. Blake* (7 P. D. 102) the facts were entirely different. The witnesses there had not the opportunity of seeing the signature of the testatrix. The mere saying, "This is my will," without such an opportunity, would not be a sufficient acknowledgment of the signature. In the present case his lordship was of opinion that there was a sufficient acknowledgment by the testatrix of that which was in fact her signature, and which was on the document at the time when the witnesses signed it, and could have been seen by them. FRY and LOPES, L.JJ., concurred.—COUNSEL, *Bayford, Q.C., and Barnard; Inderwick, Q.C., and C. A. Middleton.* SOLICITORS, *Hepburn, Son, & Cutcliffe; Storey & Cowland.*

HIGH COURT—CHANCERY DIVISION.

Re THE WEST LONDON COMMERCIAL BANK (LIM.)—Chitty, J., 11th April.

WINDING UP—PRIORITY OF CROWN—PREROGATIVE.

In this case a claim was made by the Postmaster-General, by virtue of the prerogative of the Crown to prepayment out of the assets of the above bank, now in liquidation, of sums due to the Post Office out of the moneys standing to the accounts at the bank of certain letter receivers. It appeared that the course of business, as sanctioned by the Postmaster-General, was for the receivers to pay the Post Office moneys into the bank to their own private accounts, and not to a separate account. From time to time the receivers drew cheques on the bank for payment of balances due to the Postmaster-General; these cheques were of a special kind being issued as unstamped and marked as on her Majesty's service. They also drew their own private cheques out of the mixed account.

CHITTY, J., said that the question was whether the bank were debtors to the Crown. In *R. v. Wrangham* (1 C. & J. 408) Lord Lyndhurst said that whoever received money of the Crown became an immediate debtor to the Crown. It was not necessary in the present case to raise the question whether the proposition of Lord Lyndhurst ought to be qualified by prefixing the word "knowingly" before the word "receipt," for the bank here had reason to believe that the money was Crown money. The case fell within *R. v. Ward* (2 Ex. Rep. 301), and he held that the Crown was entitled to the priority it claimed.—COUNSEL, *Sir Edward Clarke, S.G., and C. T. Simpson.* SOLICITORS, *Robert Hunter, Solicitor to the Post Office; Chapple, Welch, & Chapple.*

Re TUCKETT'S TRUSTS—Chitty, J., 10th April.

SETTLEMENT—POWER LIMITED TO INVESTMENT IN CONSOLS—NATIONAL DEBT (CONVERSION) ACT, 1888.

In this case certain residuary moneys under a testator's will had been invested by trustees and executors in pursuance of directions contained in the will in the purchase of a sum of Consols (amounting to some £13,000) and the income of the Consols applied in payment of annuities. The will contained no power to change or vary the investment, and the annuities were not made chargeable in the corpus. It was stated that in consequence of the National Debt Conversion Act, 1888, the fund would be insufficient to pay the annuities unless the Consols were sold and invested in other securities. The trustees, therefore, presented a petition to the court for their advice as to the desirability of selling out at once and re-investing in securities authorized for investment of cash under the control of the court, as provided for by section 27 of the Act.

CHITTY, J., said that, under the new Act, sections 8 (1), 26, and 27, it was perfectly clear, as it appeared to him, that trustees holding Consols could accept conversion into new stock and sell out the new stock and re-invest the proceeds in authorized securities. That being so, it would, in the event of the proposed change of investment being beneficial to the

trust, be also more advantageous to the trust to carry out the transaction by one step instead of two. He therefore advised that the trustees might sell out the Consols at once and re-invest as they had proposed.—COUNSEL, E. Ford; Benjamin Eyre. SOLICITORS, Fielder & Sumner.

CASES AFFECTING SOLICITORS.

Re PARKER AND OTHERS, SOLICITORS—Chitty, J., 12th April.

SOLICITORS AND CLIENT—COSTS—TAXATION—REMUNERATION FOR CONDUCTING SALE BY AUCTION—AUCTIONEER'S COMMISSION PAID BY CLIENT—SCALE FEE—SOLICITORS' REMUNERATION ACT, 1881—GENERAL ORDER, AUGUST, 1882, SCHEDULE I., PART 1, RULE 11.

This was a summons to review taxation, which raised the important question whether, where a sale is by public auction, and the auctioneer is paid by the client, the scale fees for conducting the sale under the General Order of August, 1882, Schedule I., part 1, made under the Solicitors' Remuneration Act, 1881, are excluded by virtue of the express provision contained in Schedule I., part 1, rule 11. It will be remembered that in *Re Newbould* (36 W. R. 161, 20 Q. B. D. 204), it was held by the Court of Appeal that, under such circumstances, the scale fees were excluded. The present case, it was stated, had been taken up by the Incorporated Law Society with the view of ultimately obtaining the decision of the House of Lords on a point of so much importance to the profession. The facts of the case, so far as were material to the question stated, were on all fours with those in *Re Newbould*, with the exception that in the present case the auctioneer was paid a lump sum of fifteen guineas, which amounted to a percentage of 6,541 1/2 shillings, and was contended to be a fee or charge, and not a commission, and, therefore, to be within the term, "auctioneer's charges," in clause 4 of the General Order.

CHITTY, J., said that all he should do would be to follow *Re Newbould*. With regard to the distinction raised between a lump sum and a commission, he thought it too slight and refined to affect the question. It was true that a commission was generally calculated at a percentage rate, but it was quite possible that a lump sum would be arrived at by a similar calculation. Moreover, the services rendered were the same, however paid for.—COUNSEL, Sir Horace Davey, Q.C., Romer, Q.C., Dauney, and R. S. Wright; Onwald. SOLICITORS, Parker, Garrett, & Parker; A. M. Bradley.

LAW SOCIETIES.

INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

At the special general meeting of the Incorporated Law Society, to be held on the 27th inst., Mr. EDMUND KIMBER will ask:

1. What the council have done towards the protection and assistance of Mr. William Turner, of Newcastle-under-Lyne, in his contest with Mr. Jordan, the county court judge?
2. What steps the council have taken (if any) in support of Lord Bramwell's Bill enabling all accused persons to give evidence?
3. What steps the council have taken (if any) towards the establishment of a court of criminal appeal, Bills for which have been introduced heretofore by responsible Governments of both political parties?
4. What steps the council have taken (if any) in support of a measure for the fusion of both branches of the legal profession?
5. What do the council propose on the subject of county court reform?
6. What checks they suggest upon unwarrantable aspersions cast by the bench upon solicitors who have no right of audience?

Mr. KIMBER will move:

1. That Mr. William Turner, of Newcastle-under-Lyne, a member of this society, be indemnified out of the funds of the society for any costs, charges, and expenses he may incur in his contest with Mr. Jordan, the county court judge.

2. That, as the Bill to enable all accused persons to give evidence has been brought into the House of Commons by the Attorney-General, this society do place in the hands of the Attorney-General a petition in support thereof, but praying, at the same time, for the re-introduction of the measure facilitating appeals in criminal cases.

3. That a petition be also presented to Parliament by this society in favour of allowing solicitors to act as advocates in all criminal cases, and in favour of the insertion of clauses in the County Court Consolidation Bill providing for solicitors being heard as advocates in the High Court in appeals from county courts, and also providing for other improvements proposed by this society's County Court Committee and by the council.

Mr. JAMES WALTER will move: That, in the interest of the public, the time has arrived when the proposition of fusion of the two branches of the profession of the law, as shadowed forth by the Solicitor-General in his recent speech at Birmingham, should be adopted.

Mr. F. K. MUNTON will move: That this meeting, while affirming the undesirability of "fusion," is of opinion that the statutory privileges enabling barristers to become solicitors should be made reciprocal.

Mr. MUNTON will ask: Whether the recommendations of the County Court Committee have been favourably received by the Lord Chancellor, and what steps the council are taking in reference thereto?

Mr. HENRY KEEBLE will move:

1. That the council of the society shall not pass any resolution having any bearing upon public political concerns.

2. That in future at least one of the general meetings of the society in each year shall be held not earlier than six o'clock p.m.

SOLICITORS' BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION.

The usual monthly meeting of the board of directors of this association was held at the Law Institution, Chancery-lane, London, on Wednesday, the 11th inst., Mr. Henry Roscoe in the chair. The other directors present were Messrs. H. Morten Cotton, G. B. Gregory, Edwin Hedger, F. H. Janson, M. T. Lawrence, R. Pennington, J. Anderson Rose, Sidney Smith, F. T. Woolbert, and J. T. Scott (secretary). A sum of £400 was distributed in grants of relief, six new members were admitted to the association, and other general business was transacted.

LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.

SOME STUDENTS' CASES.

The following cases, in addition to those noted in our issue of February 25, have been selected for students entering for the forthcoming April Final:—

1.—CONVEYANCING AND EQUITY.

Levy v. Abercrombie Slate and Slab Co. (36 W. R. 411).—Any document which either creates a debt or acknowledges a debt is a debenture.

Re Hobbs, Hobbs v. Wade (36 W. R. 445).—If a tenant by the curtesy of gavelkind land, who is only entitled to a moiety of the rents as long as he remains a widower, enters into receipt of the whole, the title of the heir to the other moiety will be statute-barred by twelve years, unless he can shew that the tenant by the curtesy acted as his agent.

Wills v. Luff (ante, p. 338).—After judgment for foreclosure absolute the plaintiff cannot obtain a receivership order.

Lavery v. Pursell (ante, p. 289).—A contract for the sale of building materials, consisting of a standing building, is an interest in land within section 4 of the Statute of Frauds if the contract gives a right to enter on the soil and hold for the purpose of pulling down.

Turn v. Turner (ante, p. 307).—A lessee of mortgaged premises—in fact, any person holding an interest carved out of the mortgagor's estate—can redeem a mortgage.

Re Butler, Hughes v. Anderson (ante, p. 337).—Marriage, *per se*, does not operate as a severance of a joint tenancy in a *chose in action* owned by the wife with others.

Mutter v. Eastern and Midlands Railway Co. (ante, p. 304).—A person whose name appears on the register of a company as owner of stocks and shares has the right to inspect and take copies of the entries in the registers, not only as far as those entries relate to himself, but also so far as they relate to all holders of similar stocks and shares.

Re Yealand Consols (ante, p. 290).—The Supreme Court rule, that where less than six days are allowed for doing an act, Sundays are not reckoned, applies to proceedings in the winding up of companies.

Re Collinge's Settled Estates (36 W. R. 264).—The tenant for life of an undivided share cannot sell such share under the Settled Land Act, 1882, without the concurrence of the parties interested in the remaining undivided share or shares.

Preston v. Bitherington (36 W. R. 49).—The Court of Appeal will not generally interfere with a judge's discretion in ordering a writ of attachment under section 4 (3) of the Debtors Act, 1869; a person can be committed under this sub-section although there has been no fraud on his part.

Ross v. School Board of London (57 L. J. Ch. D. 179).—The rule laid down in *Bain v. Fothergill*—that upon a contract for the sale and purchase of real estate, if the vendor, without fraud, is incapable of making a good title, the proposed purchaser is not entitled to recover damages for loss of his bargain, but merely expenses of investigation of title, &c.—is equally applicable to a contract for the grant of a right of way.

Re Jackson and Woodburn's Contract (36 W. R. 396).—The court has jurisdiction, upon summons under the Vendor and Purchaser Act, s. 9, to determine the validity of a notice given by a vendor to rescind his contract to sell.

Re Johnson & Weatherall (ante, p. 92, 37 Ch. D. 433).—The court has, under its general jurisdiction, power to direct taxation of an agent's bill relating to court business, and to refer part of a bill for taxation.

Reg. v. Westmoreland County Court Judge (36 W. R. 477).—The county court has no jurisdiction under the County Courts Act, 1867, s. 9, to entertain a suit for specific performance of a parol agreement to grant a right of way.

2.—COMMON LAW AND BANKRUPTCY.

Re The Missouri Steamship Co. (ante, p. 289).—An affreightment contract is governed by the law of the flag, and not by that of the *lex loci contractus*.

Lafons v. Huth & Co. (23 L. J. [N. C.] 56).—In the case of an English contract between debtor and creditor, the creditor may sue the debtor here, notwithstanding the fact that the debtor may have obtained from a foreign tribunal his discharge from the debt.

Collis v. Lewis (36 W. R. 472).—An appeal does not lie from a county court in interpleader proceedings where the amount does not exceed £20, even with leave of the judge.

Re Gardiner, Ex parte Coulson (36 W. R. 142).—A married woman who is not carrying on business separately from her husband is not liable to the bankruptcy laws.

Taylor v. Timson (57 L. J. Q. B. D. 216).—Churchwardens have no right

forcibly to prevent a parishioner entering the church for attendance on Divine worship, although they are honestly of opinion that such parishioner cannot conveniently be accommodated with a seat there.

Mullen v. Coulson (ante, p. 354).—In an action remitted under section 10 of 30 & 31 Vict. c. 142 to the county court, a defendant cannot be added without his own consent.

Re Cook, Ex parte Shilton (36 W. R. 187).—On application by a trustee in bankruptcy for leave to disclaim a lease, the vesting order may be at once offered to a sub-lessee, and, on his refusal, may be granted to a surety for the bankrupt, and, on his refusal, the lessor may himself obtain a vesting order.

3.—ADMIRALTY, PROBATE, DIVORCE, AND ECCLESIASTICAL.

Waite v. Worland (ante, p. 337).—A judicial separation will not take away a fether on anticipation from property to which the wife was entitled previously to the date of the separation.

Heyes v. Heyes (ante, p. 11).—A husband deserted his wife in consequence of her drunken habits. He saw her eight years afterwards, but did not speak to her, and shortly after heard she had committed adultery, but did not commence a suit for dissolution for some years afterwards. Held, that he had been guilty of conduct conducing to the adultery. Petition dismissed.

The Prinz Heinrich (57 L. J. P. D. A. 17). Where a master of a ship in distress makes an agreement which is neither unreasonable nor inequitable for the payment of a definite sum for salvage services, the owner of the salved ship is liable, in the first instance, for the whole amount agreed to be paid, and not merely for the proportion payable in respect of the ship.

The Argentine (13 P. D. 61).—The loss to a shipowner of profit or advantage which he would, but for the collision, have derived under a contract for the future employment of the ship, must be taken into consideration in assessing damages occasioned by such collision.

Trafalgar v. Macconochie (36 W. R. 427).—A trust to pay a weekly sum to a married woman during such time as she might live apart from her husband for her maintenance held invalid.

THE INNS OF COURT.

As a result of the General Examination of students of the Inns of Court, held at Lincoln's-inn Hall, 26th, 27th, 28th, and 29th of March last, the Council of Legal Education have awarded the following students certificates that they have satisfactorily passed a public examination:—

Charles Peter Allen, Inner Temple; David Hugh Watson Askew, Inner Temple; Robert Hugh Balloch, Inner Temple; George Leslie Banner-man, Gray's Inn; Stuart Lesley Bathurst, Lincoln's-inn; Gardner Sebastian Bazley, Inner Temple; Lakshman Gangadhar Bhadbhade, Middle Temple; Bhagat Ram, Middle Temple; Ernest Brain, Middle Temple; Arthur Frederick Burton, Inner Temple; Henry Lannoy Cancellor, Inner Temple; Alexander Keith Carlyon, Lincoln's-inn; David Lawrence Cartan, Middle Temple; Harold Watkins Cave, Inner Temple; Chan Toon, Middle Temple; Pericat Narayanaswami Chetti, Inner Temple; William Hew Colman, Lincoln's-inn; Charles Robert Connell, Middle Temple; Raoul de Bourbel, Inner Temple; Reginald Malet de Carteret, Inner Temple; Arnaud de Foilard, Middle Temple; Arscott William Harvey Dickinson, Inner Temple; Joseph Robert Fisher, Middle Temple; Samuel Joseph Goldston, Gray's-inn; Edward Harrington, Inner Temple; William Howland Jackson, Lincoln's-inn; John Kemp, Lincoln's-inn; Daniel William Lee, Inner Temple; Henry Gervaise Le Gros, Inner Temple; Henry William McGee, Lincoln's-inn; George Henry Mallinson, Middle Temple; Henry Thomas Lethbridge Marshall, Middle Temple; Thomas Maude, Inner Temple; George John Robert Murray, Inner Temple; Reginald Montague Nicholson, Lincoln's-inn; Edward Henry Nightingale, Inner Temple; M'Lean Ogle, Middle Temple; David Thomas Oliver, Middle Temple; Ralph Hilton Dodds Philipson, Lincoln's-inn; Howel John James Price, Inner Temple; Joseph Child Priestley, Inner Temple; David Renton, Inner Temple; Isaac Parker Anderson Renwick, Middle Temple; John Ross, Inner Temple; Arthur Newton St. Quintin, Inner Temple; William Henry Savigny, Inner Temple; Neville Skottowe-Parker, Gray's-inn; William Robert Smith, Middle Temple; Hugh Richard Souleby, Inner Temple; Harry Williamson Stark, Inner Temple; Paul Strickland, Lincoln's-inn; John Sullivan, Lincoln's-inn; Henry Symonds, Lincoln's-inn; Harry Tahl, Middle Temple; Robert Lawrence Thornton, Inner Temple; Charles Simkin Turner, Inner Temple; James Williamson Wearing, Middle Temple; Wel Pin, Middle Temple; Rowland Edward Whitehead, Inner Temple; Henry Francis Wilson, Lincoln's-inn; John Winkfield, Lincoln's-inn; and Frank Thomas Wrigley, Lincoln's-inn. Examined, 78; passed, 62.

The following students passed a satisfactory examination in Roman law:—

Travers Patrick Muirhead Adamson, Inner Temple; William Ryland Dent Adkins, Inner Temple; John William Aislewood, Inner Temple; Herbert John Allcroft, Inner Temple; John Woolley Allen, Inner Temple; Chris Anderson, Middle Temple; Sydney Bourne Balden, Inner Temple; William James Barry, Inner Temple; Andrew Bogan Barton, Inner Temple; Reginald Benice-Jones, Inner Temple; Frank Mildred Birch, Inner Temple; George Simonds Boulger, Middle Temple; Edward Austin Browne, Middle Temple; George Lewis Bruce, Lincoln's-inn; John Gulson Burgess, Middle Temple; Herbert Hayton Castens, Inner Temple; Ramchandra Shrinivas Chitguri, Lincoln's-inn; Herman Joseph Cohen, Inner Temple; John Lyon Corser, Inner Temple; Edward Darcy Curwen, Inner Temple; Charles Edward Ernest Damian, Gray's-inn; Richard Edmondson, Middle Temple; Charles Turnley Ellis, Gray's-inn; Percy Bagnall Evans, Inner Temple; Wentworth Hugh

Alexander Ewing, Lincoln's-inn; George Varden Fittock, Gray's-inn; Frank Baden Fuller, Inner Temple; Felix Emilie Andre Ange Galdemar, Middle Temple; Henry Peter Ganteaume, Middle Temple; Richard Davies Garnons-Williams, Inner Temple; Walter Samuel Glynn, Inner Temple; William Wilson Grantham, Inner Temple; John Castleman Swinburne Hanham, Middle Temple; Anthony Edward Harrison, Inner Temple; George Harwood, Lincoln's-inn; Charles Edward Hecht, Middle Temple; Francis Tyringham Higgins, Lincoln's-inn; John Hunt, Middle Temple; Gerard Cranworth Ince, Lincoln's-inn; Frederick Drummond Jacob, Inner Temple; Arthur Charles William Jenner, Lincoln's-inn; Albert Henry Jessel, Inner Temple; Simon Parsick Joaquim, Middle Temple; Walter Buckley Jones, Lincoln's-inn; Dosabhoj Mervanji Karaka, Middle Temple; Cheng Soon Kaw, Inner Temple; Edmund Francis Vesey Knox, Gray's-inn; Frederick Percy Lysaght, Middle Temple; John Patrick M'Clelland, Middle Temple; Malcolm M'Ilwraith, Lincoln's-inn; Alexander Hyslop Maxwell, Middle Temple; Charles Arthur Moens, Inner Temple; Vivian Morten, Inner Temple; James Martin Muir, Inner Temple; Othari Venketramanah Naidu, Middle Temple; Edward Herbert Nelson, Middle Temple; David Page, Middle Temple; Arthur Ferris Sarony Pasmore, Middle Temple; Herbert Percy Davies Phillips, Inner Temple; Arthur Lincoln Reed, Middle Temple; William Hamilton Ritchie, Inner Temple; Edgar Macdonald Robertson, Gray's-inn; Abdul Rasheed, Middle Temple; Edward Charles Percival Sanford, Inner Temple; Alfred James Sawyerr, Gray's-inn; Walter John Seton, Inner Temple; William Barrow Simonds, Inner Temple; Philip Colville Smith, Inner Temple; Rustomjee Bejanjee Sunawalla, Middle Temple; Harry Thompson Arnall Thompson, Inner Temple; Joseph Henry Atherton Tipping, Lincoln's-inn; Robert Torrance, Middle Temple; Edward Bachelor Walker, Middle Temple; Reginald Robert Sadler Waraker, Inner Temple; Sampson Walters, Inner Temple; and John Swift Whatton, Lincoln's-inn.

NEW ORDERS, &c.

NATIONAL DEBT (CONVERSION) ACT, 1888.

The Lords Commissioners of her Majesty's Treasury give notice of the following amendment of the rules made by them in pursuance of the provisions of the National Debt (Conversion) Act, 1888, and published in the supplement to the *London Gazette* of March 27, 1888:—

Rule 18 of the said rules is cancelled, and the following rule is made in substitution therefor:—

When an assent to the exchange of Consolidated £3 per Cent stock, or Reduced £3 per Cent stock, for new stock created under the Act, refers to an amount of stock upon which a "distringas" or other legal restraint has been placed, such assent will not require the concurrence of the person by whom the restraint was lodged.

The following notices have been issued by the Paymaster-General:—

CONVERSION OF NEW £3 PER CENT. STOCK.

(1) New £3 per Cent. stock standing to the credit of an account in the books of the Pay Office will be converted into 2½ per Cent. Consolidated stock unless dissents are lodged at the Pay Office on or before April 11, 1888.

(2) The new stock will bear dividends payable quarterly as follows:—viz.: For the year ending April 5, 1889, at 3 per cent; for the next following fourteen years to April 5, 1903, at 2½ per cent.; and for the then next following twenty years to April 5, 1923 (and thenceforward until redeemed) at 2½ per cent.

(3) In the case of transfers out of court of New £3 per Cent. stock, dissents must be in the form B prescribed by the Conversion Act (Funds) Rules, 1888, and the said form may be obtained at the Pay Office, Room 45.

(4) Other dissents to the conversion of New £3 per Cent. stock will be signified by a direction in the form A prescribed by the said rules, such direction to be signed by a master in Lunacy or a chief clerk in the Chancery Division.

CONVERSION OF CONSOLS AND REDUCED £3 PER CENT. STOCK.

1. Consents to the conversion of the above stocks into New Two-and-Three-Quarters per Cent. Consolidated Stock will be received at the Pay Office of the Supreme Court (Room 45, Royal Courts of Justice, London, W.C.), up to the 11th of May, 1888, and may be either delivered or sent by post. 2. The new stock will bear dividends, payable quarterly, as follows:—For the year ending April 5, 1889, at 3 per cent.; for the next following fourteen years to April 5, 1903, at 2½ per cent.; and for the then next following twenty years to April 5, 1923 (and thenceforward until redeemed), at 2½ per cent. 3. Forms of consents, to be signed in the presence of a witness by the person or persons to whom dividends on the Consols and Reduced Three per Cents. are for the time being payable, may be obtained at the Pay Office on application by letter or personally. 4. Orders or directions from the court must be obtained in some cases before the Paymaster can assent to the conversion—see Rules XL, XIV., and XXI. of the Conversion Act (Funds) Rules, 1888. 5. All solicitors or bankers who may prefer claims to commission on the conversion must write their names and addresses on the consents left or sent by them. 6. Claims for commission (in lieu of costs) must be prepared on the "Commission Form" to be obtained at the Pay Office, and should be sent in as soon as possible. They will be dealt with in

such manner as the Treasury may direct, after they have all been received and examined. No commission will be allowed in respect of stock which, through any informality or otherwise, cannot be exchanged for new stock, nor in respect of any stock for the exchange of which the consents of payees are not required, or where an order or direction is required to enable the Paymaster to make the exchange. 7. All persons residing in the United Kingdom who consent will be advised when their consents have been passed, and when the dividend and the bonus are payable. The attorneys of persons residing abroad who consent will be similarly informed.—W. HENRY WHITE, Paymaster.

LEGAL NEWS.

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. JOHN BELL, solicitor, of Appleby, has been appointed County Treasurer for Westmoreland. Mr. Bell is the son of the late Mr. John Bell, barrister. He is an M.A. of Caius College, Cambridge. He was admitted a solicitor in 1875, and he is deputy clerk of the peace for Westmoreland.

Mr. EDWARD ARCHDALE FLOODS, solicitor, of Sherborne, has been appointed by the Earl of Ichester, Lord-Lieutenant of Dorsetshire, Clerk of the Peace for that county, on the resignation of his uncle, Mr. Thomas Floods. Mr. E. A. Floods is under-sheriff for Dorsetshire. He was admitted a solicitor in 1882.

Mr. JOHN THOMAS TWEED, solicitor (of the firm of Tweed, Stephen, & Dashper), of Lincoln and Skegness, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Lincolnshire (Mr. Alexander Samuel Leslie Melville), to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the ensuing year. Mr. Tweed is town clerk of Lincoln. He was admitted a solicitor in 1845.

Mr. BENJAMIN HERBERT VORES, solicitor (of the firm of Barton & Vores), of East Dereham, has been appointed Clerk to the East Dereham Local Board. Mr. Vores was admitted a solicitor in 1875.

Mr. WATKIN WYNN PARRY, solicitor, of Holywell, Rhyl, and Abergelle, has been appointed Solicitor to the Rhyl Conservative Club Co. Mr. Parry was admitted a solicitor in 1884.

Mr. JOHN MARTIN DANAVALL, barrister, has been appointed to act as a Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of the Leeward Islands. Mr. Danavall is the son of Mr. John Martin Danavall, of St. Kitts. He was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in June, 1877.

Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL ROGERSON, solicitor (of the firm of G. R. Rogerson & Co.), of Liverpool, has been appointed a Magistrate for the County of Denbigh. Mr. Rogerson was admitted a solicitor in Trinity Term, 1862, and qualified at the Easter Denbigh Quarter Sessions.

Mr. ALEXANDER NEALE, solicitor, of No. 60, Boundary-road, South Hampstead, London, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. ARTHUR ADOLPHUS ROLLASON, solicitor, of Dudley and 11, Union-street, Birmingham, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature. Mr. Rollason was admitted in 1881.

Mr. WILLIAM FREDERICK TAYLOR, solicitor, of Macclesfield, has been appointed Town Clerk of that borough, in succession to his late partner, Mr. Joseph Barclay. Mr. Taylor was admitted in April, 1882.

GENERAL.

In order not to interfere with the Conversion scheme, Sir George Baden-Powell, M.P., has postponed till May his motion empowering trustees to invest in Colonial Government securities.

The *City Press* states that the will and codicil of Mr. Gabriel Samuel Brandon, late of Oakbrook, Hammersmith, and 15, Essex-street, Strand, solicitor, who died on February 14 last, were proved on March 21, the value of the personal estate exceeding £73,000.

A return, shewing the number of receiving orders in the High Court, and in the several county courts having bankruptcy jurisdiction in Eng., land and Wales, gazetted in the quarter ended respectively March 31-1888, 1887, and 1886, is published in the *London Gazette*. The numbers in the High Court were—for 1888, 206; for 1887, 236; and for 1886, 219. In the county courts the numbers were 1,083, 1,008, and 1,017. The highest figures in a county court during the past quarter were 30 at Bradford. In the corresponding quarter of 1887 they were 43 at Nottingham, and in 1886 31 at Birmingham.

The *Times* states that a receiving order has been made against Mr. Isaac Newton Edwards, late of 18, Parliament-street, Westminster, and St. Albans, solicitor, and who is also described as of Redbourne, Herts, farmer, and St. Albans, milkman. No statement of affairs has been filed, but the liabilities will probably exceed £17,000, and the debtor's solicitors state that it is believed the assets are sufficient to pay all the creditors in full and leave a surplus of about £5,000. The debtor, who was recently struck off the rolls (*ante*, p. 372), held the offices of Registrar of the St. Albans County Court, clerk to the magistrates, and county treasurer.

An amusing but rather alarming incident occurred on Wednesday in Court No. IV., in which Mr. Baron Huddleston and a London special

jury were engaged trying a case. Mr. Bigham, Q.C., was in the middle of his opening speech when the learned baron said he had just been informed by the superintendent that one of the transverse beams supporting the roof of the court had, the previous night, been discovered to have slipped or shrunk some inches out of its socket-bed, and that again that morning it had further started. This being so, said the learned baron, the sooner we all clear out of this the better, or we may have the roof down upon us. The court was soon left to the possession of the workmen, who, it may be hoped, will make all secure against future catastrophe.

On the 6th inst., in the House of Commons, Mr. Kelly asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether, when giving notice of his intention to move an address to her Majesty for the appointment of an additional judge of the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, he had had in mind the provisions of clause 6 of the Railway and Canal Traffic Bill now in this House, and which had already passed through the House of Lords, the language of which clause was as follows:—"On an address from both Houses of Parliament representing that, regard being had to the duties imposed by this Act on the *ex officio* commissioner, the state of business in the High Court in England requires the appointment of an additional judge of that court," &c., and whether the proposed appointment of a further judge of the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice would be in addition to or substitution for the appointment provided for under such clause 6 of the Railway and Canal Traffic Bill. Mr. W. H. Smith said the appointment of an additional chancery judge is rendered necessary by the state of business in that division of the High Court of Justice. The powers given by clause 6 of the Railway and Canal Traffic Bill will enable the Government to appoint a judge, but no such proposal will be made to the House unless the then state of business in the High Court renders it absolutely necessary that such an addition shall be made.

In Committee of Supply of the House of Commons on the 6th inst., on the vote to complete the sum of £80,222 for the Treasury, including Parliamentary Counsel, Mr. A. O'Connor said that, after allowing any amount of time for the preparation of the Local Government Bill and other measures which the Government might have had in hand, there was abundant leisure for the Parliamentary Counsel or his assistant to draft such a bill as the Employers' Liability Bill. He desired to know whether the drafting of that Bill had been given to some other counsel *en rapport* with the Treasury, and who received special fees for the special work. The Attorney-General explained that there were two permanent draftsmen at the present time in the office of the Parliamentary draftsmen, and that in ordinary circumstances they prepared the Government Bills. But there were exceptional measures, like the Land Purchase Bill, for instance, on which exceptional knowledge had to be brought to bear. In such cases counsel were employed for the purpose of drafting a particular Bill. He believed, however, that no special counsel had been employed on the Employers' Liability Bill. Mr. A. O'Connor asked, with reference to the item "fees to counsel," whether the sum of £1,200 which was considered adequate last year had this year been raised to £1,500. The Attorney-General replied that during this year the drafting had been very heavy indeed. In addition to that, Mr. Jenkyns had been seriously ill. There had probably been greater pressure on the drafting office during the last nine months than in any equal period since the office had been in existence.

COURT PAPERS.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	APPEAL COURT No. 1.	APPEAL COURT No. 2.	Mr. Justice KAY.	Mr. Justice CHITTY.
Mon., April 16	Mr. Pemberton	Mr. Koe	Mr. Lavie	Mr. Carrington
Tuesday... 17	Ward	Clowes	Pugh	Jackson
Wednesday... 18	Clowes	Koe	Lavie	Carrington
Thursday... 19	Koe	Clowes	Pugh	Jackson
Friday... 20	Jackson	Koe	Lavie	Carrington
Saturday... 21	Carrington	Clowes	Pugh	Jackson
		Mr. Justice NORTH.	Mr. Justice STIRLING.	Mr. Justice KEENEWICH.
Monday, April	16	Mr. Godfrey	Mr. Ward	Mr. Leach
Tuesday	17	Rolt	Pemberton	Beal
Wednesday	18	Godfrey	Ward	Leach
Thursday	19	Rolt	Pemberton	Beal
Friday	20	Godfrey	Ward	Leach
Saturday	21	Rolt	Pemberton	Beal

COURT OF APPEAL.

EASTER SITTINGS, 1888.

SPECIAL NOTICE.—Queen's Bench Final Appeals in Court I., and Chancery Appeals (General List) in Court II., will be taken on the usual days during Easter Sittings.

Queen's Bench Interlocutory Appeals in Court I., and Chancery Interlocutory Appeals in Court II., will be taken on the first day of the Sittings, also in Court I., probably on the second day (Wednesday), and afterwards as usual, every Wednesday, during the Sittings. Bankruptcy Appeals also, as usual, on Friday, in Court I.

Appeals from the Lancaster Palatine Court (if any), which have been passed over in the General List, will be taken in Court II. on Thursday, April 12, and Thursday, May 3.

The Admiralty Appeals (with Assessors)—namely, Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 in the Admiralty Appeal List—will be taken in Court I. on Monday, April 23, and following days.

APPEALS FOR HEARING.

(Set down to Wednesday, April 4, inclusive.)

FROM THE CHANCERY DIVISION, THE PROBATE, DIVORCE AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION (PROBATE AND DIVORCE), AND THE COUNTY PALATINE AND STANNARIES COURTS.

For Hearing.
(General List.)

1887.

- re Branksea Island Co, ld, & Co's Acts app of Rt Hon G A F Bentinck, MP, from order of Mr Justice Kay, dated 5 April, disallowing items in his claim as creditor May 23
- In re Branksea Island Co ld & Co's Acts app of Rt Hon G A F Bentinck, M.P. and Sir H. Drummond Wolff from order of Mr Justice Kay, dated 19 April, varying Chief Clerk's certificate of contributories May 23
- In re Branksea Island Co ld & Co's Acts Expte Cavendish Bentinck (a creditor) app of Richd Petts (a creditor) from order of Mr Justice Kay, disallowing claim Sept 3
- The London & Westminster Bank, ld v Turquand app of dft Harriet Danser & anr from judgt of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated May 10 Dec 19
- In re Jno Brogden, dec Billing v Brogden app of dft Samuel Brogden from judgt of Mr Justice North, dated Nov 11 Dec 24

1888.

- Siddell v Vicars, Son, & Co, ld app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Dec 21 Jan 2
- Ellington v Clark Bunnell & Co app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Kay, dated Dec 19, 1887 Jan 9
- The School Board for London v Blum app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated July 20, 1887 Jan 20
- Salaman v Jugla app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Dec 20, 1887 Jan 24
- In re The Bridgewater Navigation Co, ld, & Co's Acts (ex parte T H Birch) app of J H Birch from order of Mr Justice North, dated Jan 16, directing division of surplus assets Jan 26
- Probate Daintree & anr v Fausto & ors app of Louisa Daintree and anr from judgt of Mr Justice Butt, dated Jan 12, 1888 Jan 26
- In re Lancaster H-rbord and Patent Act, 1883 app of Messrs Perry, Davis & Sons from refusal of Mr Justice Kay to restore Trade Mark Jan 28
- In re J D Burge, dec Gillard v Lawanson app of dfts from part of order of Mr Justice Stirling on fur con, dated Aug 3, 1887 Jan 31
- Liverpool District Registry In re E Briscoe, dec Briscoe v Briscoe app of pit and dft J E Briscoe from judgt of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Jan 17, 1888 Feb 4
- Divorce Adelaide Otway v Harold E C Otway app of respt H E C Otway from decree of Mr Justice Butt, dated Dec 2, 1887, for judicial separation Feb 7
- In re The Almada and Tinto Co, ld, & Co's Acts (ex parte T C Allen) app of T C Allen from refusal of Mr Justice Chitty to strike out name from register Feb 10
- Eardley v Knight app of exors and devisees of Robert Eardley, dec, from judgt of Mr Justice Kay for foreclosure, dated May 3, 1887 Feb 10
- In re Hannah Lee, widow, dec Lee v Lee app of dft F C Lee from order of Mr Justice North, dated Feb 1, 1888, on summons Feb 13

(To be continued.)

FROM ORDERS MADE ON INTERLOCUTORY MOTIONS IN THE CHANCERY DIVISION.

Separate List.

1888.

- Spencer v The Ancoats Vale Rubber Co, ld app of pits from refusal of Mr Justice North of writ of sequestration, dated Feb 21 Mar 14
- Divorce Higginson Whyte Melville (cited, &c) v Higginson Whyte Melville (cited, &c) app of respt from refusal of Mr Justice Butt of liberty to issue writ for exam of wits in United States Mar 28
- Divorce Richard Dunn v M A Dunn and H Wall, jun M A Dunn v Richard Dunn app of Mary Ann Dunn from the President and Mr Justice Manisty refusing new trial action tried by Mr Justice Butt Mar 29

FROM THE QUEEN'S BENCH AND PROBATE, DIVORCE, AND ADMIRALTY (ADMIRALTY) DIVISIONS.

For Hearing.

1887.

- Johnson v North-Eastern Ry Co app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Day at trial at Manchester without a jury Aug 4
- Jno Lancaster & Co, ld, v Lancaster, Speir, & Co app of dfts from judgt of Baron Huddleston at trial at Monmouth Aug 16
- Howson v Barrett (Bradford D R) app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew at trial at Leeds with a jury Aug 20
- The Leek Improvement Commissioners v Justices of the Peace for the County of Stafford app of pits from judgt of Baron Huddleston at trial at Stafford without a jury Oct 15
- Arnott & ors v Brown & ors app of pits from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew at trial without a jury at Newcastle-on-Tyne Oct 19
- Newlove & ors v Shrewsbury & ors app of pits from judgt of Mr Justice Day after trial without a jury at Birmingham Oct 20
- Marquis v Pense & Partners, ld, & ors app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew at Leeds after trial without a jury at Durham Oct 28
- Attwood v Jones app of pit from judgt of Mr Justice Wills at trial without a jury at Birmingham Oct 29
- Singer v Elliott app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Butt at trial without a jury in Middx Nov 9
- Alison v Hall app of dft from judgt of Justices Mathew and Cave on special case Nov 16
- Jones & ors v Hughes app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Denman at trial without a jury at Carnarvon Nov 18
- Jones v Penybryn Slate Co, ld app of pit from judgt of Mr Justice Denman at trial without a jury at Beaumaris Nov 19
- Jones v Dorothea Slate Quarry Co app of pit from judgt of Mr Justice Denman at trial without a jury at Beaumaris Nov 19

- Chancery action Reveley v Thomas app of pit from judgt of Mr Justice Grantham for Mr Justice North at trial with a jury at Dolgelly Nov 22
- Peacock & anr v Freeman & anr app of dfts from Mr Justice Mathew at trial without a jury in Middx Nov 29
- Howard v The Metropolitan Board of Works app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Denman at trial without a jury in Middx Nov 30
- Whiteley v Barley app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew at trial without a jury in Middx Nov 30
- Godfrey v Lazarus (Q B Crown Side) app of pit from judgt of Baron Pollock & Mr Justice Hawkins on app from County Court Dec 1
- Butler v The Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Ry Co app of pits from judgt of Mr Justice Manisty, at trial at Leeds Dec 1
- Gardyne v Corbin & ors app of pit from judgt of Baron Huddleston at trial in Middx (jury discharged) Dec 5
- Lockhart v Mayor, &c, of St Albans (Q B Crown Side) app of pit from Justices Stephen and A L Smith affirming order of sessions for payment of rate for paving Rutter v Mayor, &c, of St Albans app of pit from the same judgt Dec 6
- Swain v Ayres & ors app of dft W M Luck from judgt of Mr Justice Charles at trial without a jury in Middx Dec 7

(To be continued.)

FROM ORDERS MADE ON INTERLOCUTORY MOTIONS IN THE QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

1887.

- R H Yarmouth v W France, ld app of dfts from order of the Master of the Rolls & Lords Justices Lindley & Lopes for new trial on hearing appeal from county court Aug 26
- Jowett v Local Board of Idle in the county of York app of pits from Justices Stephen and Charles on app for new trial setting aside verdict and judgment and directing judgt for defendant—action tried by Mr Justice Manisty at Leeds Dec 19
- Rayden v Carter app of pit from Justices Stephen & Charles refusing new trial—action tried by Baron Pollock with a jury in Middx Dec 23
- Hance & anr v Harding app of dft from judgt of Baron Huddleston at trial of interpleader issue by settlement trustees against Chief Official Receiver in bankruptcy Dec 28
- Fitzgerald v Thompson app of pits from Justices Mathew and Charles refusing new trial—action tried by Mr Justice Day with jury at Carlisle Dec 30

(To be continued.)

FROM PROBATE, DIVORCE, & ADMIRALTY DIVISION. (ADMIRALTY).

For Hearing.

With Nautical Assessors.

1887.

- Ship Henriette (damage) Owners of the Druid v Owners of the Henriette app of dfts from judgt of the President, dated 6 Aug, 1887 Aug 30
- Ship Hubback (damage) Stoomvaart Maatschappij Nederland, owners of Prins Hendrik cargo and freight and ors v Owners of the Hubback and freight app of pits from judgt of Mr Justice Butt, dated 28 June, 1887 Oct 4
- Ship El Mouncef (salvage) London and Edinburgh Shipping Co & ors v Owners of SS El Mouncef app of pits from judgt of the President, dated 2 Nov 1887 Nov 7
- Ship Memnon (damage) Campanhia Bahiana de Navegacao a Vapor v Owners of SS Memnon app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Butt dated 6 Dec 1887 Dec 20
- Ship Henza (damage) Dixon & ors v Owners of SS Henza app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Butt, dated 5 Dec, 1887 Dec 24
- 1888.
- Ship Swallow (damage) Marquand & ors v The Owners of the Swallow app of pits from judgt of Mr Justice Butt, dated 18 Nov, 1887 Jan 6
- Ship Palinurus (damage) Owners of cargo of E F Sawyer v Owners of Palinurus and freight app of pits from judgt of the President, dated 17 Dec, 1887 Jan 13
- Ship Lillie (damage) The Owners of the SS Cambria v The Owners of the SS Lillie app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Butt, dated 18 Jan, 1888 Feb 20
- Ship Buccleuch (damage) The Owners of Ship Baroda and her master and crew v The Owners of Ship Buccleuch and freight The Owners of cargo of Ship Baroda v The Owners of Ship Buccleuch and freight app of dfts from judgt of the President, dated 18 Jan, 1888 Feb 21
- Ship Casapedia (damage) Owners, masters and crew of Ship Oxfordshire v Owners of Ship Casapedia and freight app of dfts from judgt of the President, dated 24 Feb, 1888 Mar 8
- Ship Ardmore (damage) Owners of the Wilhelm Voos & ors v Owners of the Ardmore and freight app of pits from judgt of the President, dated 25 Feb, 1888 Mar 27

N.B.—The following Admiralty Appeals, with Assessors—namely, Nos 1, 2, 3, and 4 in the above List—will be in the Daily List for hearing in Appeal Court 1. on Monday, April 23, and following days:—

- 1.—Ship Henriette
- 2.—Ship Hubback
- 3.—Ship El Mouncef
- 4.—Ship Memnon

APPEALS IN BANKRUPTCY.

- In re Jas Mc Henry Expte E McDermott app of E McDermott from Mr Registrar Hazlitt finding certain sums belonging to estate, and directing payment to trustee
- In re T F Burke Expte Percy Mason (trustee) app of bankrupt from order of Mr Justice A L Smith directing bankrupt to answer questions
- In re Horatio Claggett (an insolvent debtor) Expte Lewis and anr app of Lewis and anr from Mr Registrar Giffard refusing order for payment of interest on judgt debt
- In re Thos S Ashwin Expte Sydney Pollock app of trustee (J B Ball) from Mr Justice Cave allowing proof of Sydney Pollock
- In re James Gence Expte Kearsley & Co app of creditors from order of Mr Registrar Brougham refusing to restrain trustee proceeding with sale
- In re John Norris Expte Geo Reynold's (a creditor) app of Geo Reynolds from order of Mr Justice Hazlitt setting aside bankruptcy notice

In re Arthur Kelday & ors Expte J F Meston app of J F Meston from Mr Registrar Haslitt adjourning appln to set aside bankruptcy notice

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

CHANCERY DIVISION.

EASTER SITTINGS, 1888.

Causes for Trial or Hearing.

(Set down to Wednesday, April 4, inclusive.)

Motions, Petitions, and Short Causes will be taken on the usual days, as stated in the Easter Sittings Paper.

Actions with and without Witnesses will be taken by Mr. Justice Kay on the usual Cause days in the order as they stand in the Cause Book.

Mr. Justice Chitty will take Witness Actions on the following days, viz.:—April 24, 25, 26; May 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, and 10.

Mr. Justice North will take Witness Actions on days to be named by his Lordship after the commencement of the Sittings.

Mr. Justice Stirling will also take Witness Actions on days to be named by his Lordship; his Lordship will sit in Chambers every Monday during the Sittings. Mr. Justice Kekewich will take Witness Actions every day, in the order as they stand in the Cause Book. See Note on Sittings Paper as to Liverpool and Manchester District Registry Business.

Adjourned Summonses will be taken as follows:—Mr. Justice Kay, on Fridays and Saturdays; Mr. Justice Chitty, with Non-Witness Actions, except Procedure Summonses, which (if any) are taken every Saturday; Mr. Justice North, on Fridays and Saturdays, and Mr. Justice Stirling also on Fridays and Saturdays.

N.B.—The above note as to adjourned summonses is subject to alteration as their Lordships may direct.

Before Mr. Justice KAY.

Causes for Trial (with witnesses and without witnesses).

Eden v Weardale Iron Co, 11 act wits (Trinity Sittings)

Ecclesiastical Commrs v Sir W Eden act wits (Trinity Sittings)

Kirby v Freeman act wits

Wills v Joyes act wits

Munro v Met & Mt Dist Ry Co act wits

Ryder v Auders act

Sampson v Streatham & Genl Estate Cold act wits

Edison & Swan & Co v Holland act

White v Peto Bros act wits

Booker v Rollinson act wits

India Rubber, & Co, v Healey's Telegraph, & Co, act wits

Butcher v Galmoye act wits (Not before April 24)

Armstrong v Hall act wits (Not before May 4)

Meldrum v Scorer act wits

Gilbert & Spurrier, ld v Spurrier act wits

Cunningham v Mid & S W Junction Railway Co act wits

Banister v Cliff act wits

Wethered v Cox m f j wits

Longbottom v Shaw act wits

In re Wordsworth, Tavenor v Wordsworth act

Gilbert v Gilbert act wits

Brage v Vincent act wits

Redhead v Westwood act

Baring v Baring act

Morgan v Maritime Colliery Co, ld act

Vernon, Ewens, & Co v Arbuthnot act

In re Land Corporation of England, ld, & Co's Acts mtn

Woodland v Crocker act wits

Roberts v Roberts act wits

Davis v Collis act wits

Ogle v Mutual Life Assurance Society act wits

Fyson v Marsden act

Pere v King act

Briggs v Botham act

In re Curahan, Curahan v Gallimore act wits

Storrs v Peto act

Ingram v Davis act wits

Blakey v Latham & Co action wits

Harper v Lunnage action wits

Lucy v Brynon action wits

Fry v Lane Lane v Fry action wits

British Burmah Lead Co ld v Law action wits

Atkinson v Atkinson action wits

Wright v Holroyd mtn for judgt

Chapman v Perceval action wits

Deuraice & Co v Hopkinson action wits

In re Fry Whitall v Bush act & m f j wits

Bugg v Dry Docks Corp of London, ld act wits

In re Booker Booker v Herepath act

Bovington v Currey act & m f j

In re Hutchinson Hutchinson v White act wits

Scarborough v Thorman act wits

Scarborough v Woolley act wits

London Joint Stock Tea Co, ld v Fox & Bousfield act wits

Payne v Stevens act wits

Maberly v Barron, Bart act wits

Heavens v Brown act

Ungar & Co v Sugg & Co, ld act wits

United Telephone Co, ld v Berry & Son act wits

Lovekin v Dudley Ryder act wits

Phillips v Harries act

Boyd v Farrar act wits

Whitaker v Vander Swissem act

In re Creasey Creasey v Creasey m f j

Morgan v Wright m f j

Quartermaine v Smith act wits

In re Hilton Wall v Clear point of law

Crowley v Smith act wits

Adam v Fortescue act wits

Tagart v Boyson act wits

In re Drayson Lister v Lister act wits

Howard v Still act

To be continued.

Further Consideration.

In re C Readdy Readdy v Readdy fur con

Adjourned Summonses.

In re The Norwich Equitable Fire Assurance Co (Not before June 8)

Besson v Fontaine (for sale, &c.)

Besson v Fontaine (appt of receiver and manager)

Besson v Fontaine (for removal of receiver)

Besson v Fontaine (for four day order)

In re Edwards Rudkin & Green & V & P Act pt heard

In re Railway & Electric Appliances Cold & Co's Acts

Knight v Greenway

Pitt v Teeran

Devall v Smith

Before Mr. Justice CHITTY.

Causes for Trial (with witnesses)

Yates v Watkins act

Checkland v Fisher act

White v Hewitt act (May 1)

In re Phillips, dec Rogers v Bullock adj sums with wits by order

Newton v L & N W Ry Co act

In re E M Smith, dec Robinson v Smith act

Schultz v Middleton, Thomas v Abadam act

In re Checkland, dec, Leicestershire Banking Co v Checkland act

Caan v Wilson act cross-examination Affidavits (April 18)

Blorc v Blackwell Blackwell v Blorc act & m f j

Acland v Napleton act

In re T Cardus, dec, Armstrong v Paris act

British Mutual Banking Co v Mann act

Palmer v Palmer act

In re Read, dec, Wood v Neal act

Gourand v Edison Gower Bell Telephone Co of Europe act

Pilkington v Drake act

Rogerson v Lord Revelstoke, Lord Revelstoke v Rogerson claim act

Gaz v Wingfield act

Downing v Falmouth United Sewerage Bd act

Plekering v Allan act

Hillier v Broad act

Hunt v Porter act (Bristol D R)

Farber v C W Price & Co act

Spiel's Patent Petroleum Engine Co, ld v Spiel act

In re Edwin Ives, dec Ives v Ives act

In re M Cragg, dec Cragg v Ashburner act

Clarke v Hill act

Jarvis v Batter act

Bressac v American Exhbn, ld act

Osborne v Cummins act

Frank v Bailey act

Brooks v Brooks act (trans from Kay, J)

Caspar v Glass Decoration Co, ld act

Walthamstow Local Bd v Halbert act

Walthamstow Local Bd v Staines act

Regent's Canal City & Docks Ry Co v Smith & Co act

Dye v Martin act

Betta v Chaswright act

North-Eastern Ry Co v Normanby Local Board act

(To be continued.)

Non-Witness Causes, Adjourned Summonses, and Special Cases.

In re Winfield's Estate Higgin v Higgin (claim against estate) adj sum pt hd

In re Thornhill's Estate Thornhill v Nixon adj sums (restored after revival against Mrs Robinson's exors)

In re H W Parker & ors, Solicitors Expte Blenkhorn (taxn) adj sums (April 12 by order)

Kennedy v Orrell act 1887—K—153 (May 7)

In re C B King's Estate King v Alston adj sums (under order 55)

In re Capital Guarantee Soc Elkins v Capital Guarantee Soc Expte Liquidator adj sums

Bertie v Ld Norreys adj sums (revr's act) (not before May 2)

In re Abraham's & Furtado's Contract & V & P Act Expte Furtado adj sums

In re W Hyatt's Estate Bowles v Gillett adj sum

In re Winfield's Estate Higgin v Higgin (Brook's claim) adj sum

In re M G Weir's Estate Hollingworth v Willing adj sums

Young v Tomlinson adj sums

In re Civil Service and General Stores ld Expte cases of Read, Newbery, & Fry

In re Richd Flint's Estate Coppock v Vaughan adj sums

In re Millington, dec Millington v Martin m f j

In re Robt Dickinson's Estate Marquis of Bute v Walker Expte Shipley & Hoyle adj sum

Dickinson v Dickinson (Settled Land Act) Expte Shipley & Hoyle adj sums

In re Henry Berens's Estate Berens v Berens adj sums

Kimber, on behalf, &c v Shingleton Ice Co, ld act

Stanton v Stanton m f j

In re Hull, Barneley and West Riding Junction Ry Co Galland's claim adj sums

In re Hull, Barneley and West Riding Junction Ry Co Wigers' claim adj sums

In re J Powis, dec Powis v Powis Chas Powis' claim adj sum

In re A M Killick's Estate In re Harriet Killick's Estate Killick v Elder adj sums (order 55)

In re Royal Exchange Shipping Co, ld Expte Dennis, Brown & Co adj sum

In re Same Expte Geo Holt & Co adj sums

In re Same Expte Off Lqdr adj sum

In re Coulson's Settlement Trusts Ellis v Cowell adj sum (title to money)

In re C Coulson's Settlement Trusts Cowell v Ellis adj sums administration

In re C Coulson's Estate Cowell v Ellis adj sums construction

Fisher v Fisher m f j (short)

Groves v Dixon adj sums

In re Ferguson's Settlement Ferguson v Emmet adj sums (title to income of Trust Fund)

In re Northern London Estates Co, ld Expte Hunt adj sums to remove from contributories

In re C N Newdegate's Estate Newdegate v Rowley adj sums by tenant for life (55)

Arden v Arden adj sums expte exors of J Arden the son Arden v Arden adj sums expte Arthur Richards, an incumbrancer Arden v Arden adj sum: expte Alex Howden, party having conduct

In re Brian Bates' Will Trusts Hoyland v Bates adj sums (order 55)

Ellis v Ellis act

In re Fryman's Estate Fryman v Fryman adj sums (payment out of court)

In re The Midland Land Corporation adj sums

In re J Walker's Estate Walker v Pullen originating adj sums

In re T Reed's Estate Reed v Morrison originating adj sums

To be continued.

Further considerations

In re Bailly, dec Bailly v Bailly fur con sums to vary and pls mtn to discharge receiver

In re Carliell, dec Robinson v Pentara fur con

In re Thos Taylor, dec Taylor v Taylor fur con

In re M Clark, dec Clark v De Bentley fur con

Burnside v Burnside fur con reservel by decre, dated 21 Dec, 1872

Before Mr. Justice NORTH.

Causes for Trial (with witnesses).

Carnochan v Ireland act

In re Ellis Jones Jones v Evans act

Winfield v Crompton act

Adams v Sweeting act

Newton v Hillman act

Stevens v Haws act

Hall v Peebles act

In re Clarke's Trade Mark mtn cross-examined by order

Pearce v Curcio act

Moffatt v Pesce act

Wagman v Belgrave act

MacColla v Penn act

Farrand v Yorkshire Bkg Co ld act

Kohner Dynsmite Fab'k Co v Cox act

Clarke v Beedler & Co act

Martin v Clarke act

Macqueen v Simpson act

Baxter v Lon & Prov Bkg Co ld act

Hayes v Hayes act

Sladden v Johnson act

Surbiton Improvement Commrs v Metcalfe act

Day v Woolwich Equitable Bldg Soc act

In re Frowen Frowen v Frowen act

Hine Haycock v Hamerton act

Clarke v Birley act

Brown v Teedale act

Tudball v Medilott act

Coulson v Pettiver act Vine v Pettiver act

Gooden v Coles act

Barber v Weaver act

Brodie v Paine action

Great Tower Street Tea Co v Smith act

Anthony v Courtney act

Ager v Best & Co act

In re J Jones Jones v Evans act

Edvala v Cohen act

O'Dwyer v Earl of Breadalbane act

Whipple v Lindsay action

In re Elam Bushan v Elam act

To be continued

Causes for Trial (without witnesses)
 Booth v Shaw act restored
 Hodgson v Reynolds act
 Earl of Aylesford v Earl Ponsett act
 In re Oliver Townsend v Baxter act
 In re Brown Fletcher v Brown spec case
 Jenny v Mackintosh m f j
 Bywater v Lord Salisbury act
 Jackson v Hannington act
 In re Cook Cook v Cook special case and m f j
 Jowitt v Austin act
 Marshall v Scarborough, &c, Ry Co act
 Fielden v Davison m f j
 Knocker v Swannell act
 Mills v Wrench m f j
 In re Wrench Gureys & Co v Wrench m f j (short)

Further considerations
 In re Jaffe Hull v Grainger fur con
 In re Dovey Priek v Mitchell fur con
 In re Priceley Hood v Priestley fur con
 In re Haffenden Russell v Denman fur con & sums
 In re Haswell Haswell v Haswell fur con
 In re East East v Barrow fur con
 Wicking v Booser fur con & sums
 Richardson v Fary fur con
 In re Palmer Ogg v Palmer fur con
 Blaydes v Chapman fur con
 In re Davis Davis v Davis fur con
 In re Sacre Mahoney v Sacre fur con
 In re Worrall Worrall v Willington fur con
 In re R as Ashton v Ross fur con

Adjourned summonses.
 Evans v Blackwall
 In re Elliott Elliot v Godfrey rested
 In re Hodgson & Simpson & Trade-Marks Act, &c
 In re Werwick Robson v Worawick
 In re Vinten Vinten v Vinten
 In re Nelson Bratt v Nelson
 In re Fletcher Gillings v Fletcher
 In re Hastie & Crawford, Solrs to vary Taxing Master's cert.
 In re Homer District Consolidated Gold Mines Id & Co's Acts
 In re Turner's Will and Act, 10 & 11 Viet. c. 96
 In re Jackson Jackson v Talbot
 In re M Edwards Francis v Edwards
 In re T Edwards Francis v Edwards
 In re Martin Edwards, &c taxation
 In re Same to vary Taxing Master's certificate
 Parker v Parker for sale
 Parker v Parker for partition
 In re J James James v Murgatroyd
 In re McKellar Oakley v Short
 In re Frankish Frankish v Frankish
 In re Farr Wigg v Parker
 In re Webster Hall v Webster
 In re Parkes & Sibun's Contract
 Hugill v Wilkinson
 In re Londonderry Clayton v Marquis of Londonderry
 In re Balmont Luxton v Balmont
 In re Baker Baker v Baker
 In re Lord Chesterfield's Will, &c.
 In re W. Jenkin's Will, &c
 In re Luxmore Gordon v Woods (to come on with motion)
 In re Apsey Royle v Marshall
 In re Frewen Frewen v James
 In re Hulton Lister v Hulton
 In re Phillips Phillips v Allen
 In re Knox Parsons v Smith (restored)
 In re Graves Owen v Synge
 In re Olivant's Will & S Land A t (restored)
 In re Stevens Stevens v Kell-y
 In re King Wright v King
 Rudduck v Rudduck
 In re Pearson Pearson v Pearson
 In re Sevier Sevier v Bowden
 In re Chantrey Leighton v Hughes House Property, &c., Co v Keen's Abrahams v Shapter

Before Mr. Justice STIRLING.
Causes for Trial (with witnesses).
 Insale v Mayor, &c, of Cardiff act
 Moore v Tylee act
 Wheatley v Freeman act pt heard
 Crosti v Ferreira act

Crosti v Ferreira act
 Miller v Tupp act
 Goodspeed v Robinson act
 Goodspeed v Robinson act
 In re Messrs Batts & Co's Trade Mark motin
 The Herden Star, &c, Co v Lewis Hand Fire, &c, Coy act advd by order
 Blyth v Smith act
 Watson v Robson act
 Tallack v Armstrong, Mitchell, & Co ld
 Lea v Chambers act
 Fish v Lyon act
 Croasley v Burrows act and petn
 Butler & Co v Hall act
 Knott v Turnbull act
 Chilli Gold Mining Co ld v Harvey act
 Newman v Chubb act
 In re Roebuck, Whitley v Whitley act
 In re The London Improved Cab Co, & Co's Acts motn of F. C. Bryant
 In re the same Co, motn of W. Carkeet
 Atkins v Darcy act
 Kelday v Bailey act
 In re The Apollinaris Co, & Patents Designs, &c, Act motn
 Batty v Cail act
 In re Cutcliffe-Cutcliffe v Harding act
 Beck v Hop Bitters Co act
 Van Praeg v Brotherton act
 Arniason v Smith act
 In re Ingham Lonsdale v Rowan act
 Gent v Williams act
 Jenkins v Jackson act
 Beken v Martyn act
 (To be continued.)

Adjourned Summonses & Non-Witness Actions.
 In re Meynell Holmes v Meynell issues of fact (not before Trin Sittge)
 In re Corsellis Lawton v Elwes adjd sums
 In re Charlton Charlton v Chappell adjd sums (April 17)
 Ledbrook v Passmann act
 In re Hall to Flemmick & V & P Act 1874 adjd sums
 In re Stokes Ackman v Pagot adjd sums
 In re Wainman Peake v Wainman adjd sums
 In re Frost Frost v Booth adjd sums
 In re Mercer Watson v Hodgson adjd sums
 In re Paddison Tonge v Paddison adjd sums
 In re Benn Benn v Benn adjd sums
 In re Wilson Sparke v Wilson adjd sums
 In re Colyer Seelling v Seelling adjd sums
 In re Colyer Seelling v Seelling adjd sums
 Turner v Dry Docks Corps of Loe, ld adjd sums
 In re Bryant & May, ld & Patent Designs &c Act adjd sums
 In re The Palatine Estate Charity and Charitable Trusts Acts adjd sums
 In re Marquis of Donegal Diamond v Penington adjd sums
 In re Robinson Pinder v Robinson adjd sums
 In re Mordauff Bacon v Burgoine adjd sums
 Hazel v Stephenson adjd sums
 Stumore v Mont Dore of Bournemouth ld adjd sums
 In re The London and Prov'l Prov'd Assold & Co's Acts adjd sums
 In re Wilkins Durrant v Durrant adjd sums
 In re Chalk Coombe v Rutland adjd sums
 In re The Tergorine Co, ld & Co's Acts adjd sums
 In re The Same & Co's Acts adjd sums
 In re Saville Watkins v Malcolm adjd sums
 In re Blundell Blundell v Blundell adjd sums
 In re Jepson Stone v Lopell adjd sums
 In re The Credit Co, ld & Co's Acts adjd sums
 In re Fisher Fisher v Fisher adjd sums
 In re W Coken, dec adjd sums
 In re Hooton Hooton v Hooton adjd sums
 In re Clarke Clarke v Hartley adjd sums

In re Bullock Gardiner v Harris adjd sums
 In re Sir R Peel Peel v Peel adjd sums
 In re Dean Dean v Hanson adjd sums
 In re Worth & Watney & V & P Act adjd sums
 In re Carrick Carrick v Richardson adjd sums

To be continued.

Further Considerations.
 In re Benrose Brant v Judd fur con
 In re Mitchell Cooper v Attorney-General fur con
 Minus v Gregory fur con
 Pragnell v Minus fur con
 In re Kirkpatrick Kirkpatrick v Kirkpatrick 2nd fur con
 Cooke v Hunt fur con
 In re Loftus Otway Otway v Loftus Otway fur con

Before Mr. Justice KKEWICH.
Causes for Trial (with witnesses).
 Verney v Thomas act Verney v Thomas m f j (April 11)
 Parker v Bingham act
 Transferred from Justices CHITTY, NORTH, and STIRLING, for Trial or Hearing only—by Order, dated 14th June, 1887.
 Capel & Co v Sims Ship's Composition Co, ld pt heard act (April 11)
 In re Infield Infield v Marten act

Transferred from Justices CHITTY, NORTH, and STIRLING, for Trial or Hearing only—by Order, dated 4th Nov, 1887.
 Hopkinson v Peruvian Guano Co act (not before April 23)
 Sharp v Goody, Cripps, & Son, ld act
 Anglo-American Brush, &c, Co v Edison & Swan & Co act (not before May 10)
 Anglo-American Brush, &c, Co v Edison & Swan, &c Co act (not before May 10)
 In re Alliston Hall v Bros act
 Do by v Watson act
 Kelly & Co v Pike & anr act
 Shatto v Bolckow, Vaughan & Co act (not before 23 April)
 Skryme v Halford act (not before 30 April)
 Grayburn v Blyton act
 In re Postlethwaite and re Rickman Postlethwaite v Rickman act
 Thompson v Keats act
 Quick v Bidder act

In re Torrington Cole v Wills act (not before 23 April)
 Holborn Hill Industrial Co-operative Soc ld v Park act (11 April)
 Womble v Kempvance act
 Williams v Jones act
 Haywood v Faloon act
 Gargini v Bongiovanni act
 Smyth v Adams act
 Hubback v Storer & Sons act
 Roberts v Sheard act
 In re Dale Lewis v Powell act
 Bishop v Eastern & Midlands Ry Co act
 Ha ling v Marine & Gen Land, &c Co, ld act
 Williams v Caspar act
 Leverett v Hamer act
 Evans v Gibbs act
 Webb v Jones act
 Coates & Co v Moyle & Son act set down for fthr trial by order of Ct of App, 22 Nov, 1887
 In re Cawie Cawie v Hemaley act (Liverpool D. R.) appln entd in London order changing venue to London
 Schwabe v Crankshaw act for trial Crankshaw v Schwabe Manchester D. R.
 Transferred from Justices CHITTY, NORTH, and STIRLING, for Trial or Hearing only—by Order, dated 22 Mar., 1888.
 In re Trafford Nixon v Fogg act & motn for judgt
 Gill v Hunt counter claim
 Sanders v Morle act
 In re Jenkins Jenkins v West act & motn for judgt
 Hondret v Paterson act
 Briton & Life Assoc v Scott act
 In re Derbon Derbon v Collis act
 In re Whitehead Whitehead v Whitehead act
 Russell v Bartlett act
 Tulk v Philp act
 Worthy v Richardson act
 Harvey v Blount act
 Whelan v Palmer act
 Negus v Wallis act
 Briton Assurance Soc v Bradley act
 Morgans v Morgans act
 Cox v Clear act
 Radcliffe v Colson act
 Marsh v J nes act
 London Haneatic Bk ld v Mendel act
 In re Campbell Brandon v Curtis act
 Cray v Rikan act
 Errington v Lewis act
 To be continued.

WINDING UP NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, April 6.
 JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.
 LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

PATENT OXONITE CO, LIMITED.—Ptn for winding up, presented April 4, directed to be heard before Kay, J., on April 14 Blunt & Lawford, Gresham st, solrs for ptnr
 SUSSEX MILITARY TRAINING COLLEGE CO, LIMITED.—Ptn for winding up, presented March 20, directed to be heard before Kay, J., on April 14 Mitchell, Cannon st, solrs for ptnr

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

EAST AND WEST INDIA DOCK PROVIDENT SOCIETY, West India Dock March 31

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, April 10.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

FREE GIFT FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Crooked Billet Inn, Worsthorn, Lancaster. April 6
 HULL CUSTOMS OFFICERS' LIFE ASSURANCE FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Customs House, Kingston upon Hull. April 6
 HUSBANDMEN'S CLUB OR FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Butchers' Arms Inn, Bradninch, Devon. April 6
 RINTON HILL FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Bull and Butcher Inn, Upper Gornal, Stafford. April 7
 ST. PHILEMON'S, TOXTETH PARK, SICK AND BURIAL TONTINE SOCIETY, St Philemon's Schoolroom, Windsor st, Toxteth pk, Liverpool. April 7
 WORKING MAN'S TRESPASS BROTHERLY GIFT FUND SOCIETY, St John's Hall, Exmouth st, Clerkenwell. April 7

WARNING TO INTENDING HOUSE PURCHASERS AND LESSEES.—Before purchasing or renting a house have the Sanitary arrangements thoroughly examined by an expert from The Sanitary Engineering & Ventilation Co., 11b, Victoria-st., Westminster (Estab. 1875), who also undertake the Ventilation of Offices, &c.—[ADVT.]

STAMMERS AND STUTTERS should read a little book by Mr. B. BRASLEY, Baron's-court-house, W. Kensington, London. Price 15 stamps. The author, after suffering nearly 40 years, cured himself by a method entirely his own.—[ADVT.]

CREDITORS' NOTICES. UNDER 22 & 23 VICT. CAP. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, March 30.

BADDELEY, HENRY, Park rd, Oldham, Ironmonger. April 21. Slater & Co, Manchester
 BARNETT, SAMUEL, Benhill Lodge, Sutton, Pawnbroker. May 15. Freeman & Son, Gutter lane
 BRET, THOMAS, Bookham st, New North rd. April 15. Dallimore, Camberwell New rd
 BRIDGES, HERBERT WESTON, Tacoma, Washington Territory, U.S.A., Gent. May 1. Miller & Co, Cophall ct
 BRIDGETT, GREGORY, Naval and Military Club, Piccadilly, a retired Assistant Commissary General in her Majesty's Army. May 1. Cooke, New inn
 CARTMALE, MARY, Lichfield. May 1. Hinckley & Co, Lichfield
 CHURCHMAN, WILLIAM, The Cartax, Horsham, Gent. May 31. Fielder & Sumner, Goddman st
 COOK, THOMAS WILLIAM, Cromwell rd, South Kensington. May 15. Vallance & Vallance, Essex st
 DENMAN, ELIZABETH ANN, Ham st, Ham, Surrey. Apr 30. Tempny & Co, Bedford row
 ELKINGTON, SARAH ANNE, Monument rd, Edgbaston, nr Birmingham. May 15. Royle Shore, Birmingham
 EVANS, EDWARD JAMES, Downfield House, nr Kingston, Hereford, Esq. May 1. Sale, Leominster
 FIELD, SARAH ANN, Clarence rd, Hackney. May 1. Miller & Co, Cophall ct
 FRASER, HENRY SEYMOUR, Headley, Liphook, Hants, Esq. May 1. Baker & Co, Lincoln's inn fields
 GEORGE, CHARLES, Sydenham rd. Croydon. Apr 30. Renshaws, Suffolk lane
 HILLS, FREDERICK, Golborne gdns, North Kensington. Apr 14. Pearson, Southampton st, Bloomsbury
 HODGSON, WILLIAM, Burnaston, York, Yeoman. April 14. Donner, Scarborough
 JAMIESON, HUGH, Brompton crescent, Kensington, Esq. May 1. Miller & Co, Cophall ct
 KAY, RICHARD SMITH, Park st, Grosvenor sq. May 31. Miller & Son, Savile row
 LAYCOCK, BETSY, Scarborough. April 14. Donner, Scarborough
 LEE, HARRIET SOPHIA, Elmfield, Winchester. May 1. Scotney & Shenton, Winchester
 MALBY, REBECCA, Regent st, Derby. June 1. Briggs, Derby
 MILLS, MARK, Lee, Kent, Esq. June 1. Gard & Co, Gresham bds
 NEWMAN, JAMES, Worton, Potterne, Wilts, Retired Farmer. May 31. Marshall, Devizes
 PARKER, EDWARD, Victoria rd, Broomhall pk, Sheffield, Gent. May 12. Brown & Son, Sheffield
 PARKINS, MARY, Harrow Weald, Middlesex, Baker. April 21. Hinton, Angell rd, Brixton
 PENNINGTON, AGNES, Kendal, Westmoreland. May 22. Wareing & Cropper, Liverpool
 PERRY, HARRY, Tredgare Works, Bow, Builder and Contractor. May 14. Manns & Longden, Old Jewry
 PHILLIPS, WILLIAM, Market st, Colne, Ironmonger. April 18. Carr & Son, Colne
 POTTS, SAMUEL JAMES, Mansfield, Nottingham, Druggist. April 21. Maltby, Mansfield
 PROVIS, WILLIAM ALEXANDER, Granville rd, Eastbourne, M.R.C.S. May 1. Ewer, Fenchurch st
 RANSON, HANNAH, Kingston upon Hull. April 30. Wilson & Sons, Hull
 RANSON, STICKNEY, Sutton, York, Gent. April 30. Wilson & Sons, Hull
 RANSON, WILLIAM, Welton, East Riding of York, Farmer. April 30. Wilson & Sons, Hull
 RICHMOND, THOMAS GOODIER, Peabury, nr Macclesfield, Chester, Esq. F.R.C.S. May 15. Freeman & Son, Gutter lane
 ROLFE, CHARLES, Ferndale rd, Brixton, Vestry Clerk. April 25. Peard, Sise lane
 ROSS, JOHN, Freemanth, Southampton, Master Mariner. April 24. Scotney & Shenton, Winchester
 SLATE, HARRIETT, William st, Albany st, Regent's pk. May 1. Miller & Co, Cophall ct
 STEWART, CHARLES EDWARD, Bungalow, Walthamstow, Commander in the Merchant Service. May 1. Hubbard, Chancery lane
 STREETON, FREDERICK, Kutawa, in the District of Assiniboia, North West Territories of Canada, Farmer. May 1. Saxton & Morgan, Somerset street
 WILLIAM, JOHN BROMFIELD, Gateshead, Liverpool, Coal Merchant. May 1. Miller & Co, Cophall ct
 WRIGHT, SUSANNAH, Monton, nr Manchester. May 1. Eccles & Dempster Smith, Liverpool
 YATES, JOHN, Atherton, Lancaster, Gent. May 12. Lancashire, Manchester
 London Gazette.—TUESDAY, April 3.
 BRANDON, GABRIEL SAMUEL, Hammersmith, Solicitor. May 1. G. S. & H. Brandon, Essex st
 BROWNLOW, GEORGE, Mattersey, Nottingham, Gent. May 23. Cartwright & Walker, Bawtry
 BUCKLEY, JOHN, Hanley, Stafford, Miller. May 31. Heath, Hanley
 CAFFERATA, AUGUSTA, Seacombe, Chester. April 17. Lynch & Tebbay, Liverpool
 FOWNE-LUTTRELL, CHARLOTTE ANN, Minehead, Somerset. May 10. Clarke & Lukin, Chard
 GEDGE, CHARLES (not GEORGE, as erroneously printed in last Gazette), The Linden, Sydenham rd, Croydon. April 30. Renshaws, Suffolk lane
 GILMORE, WILLIAM RODGER, Liverpool, Esq. April 30. Bateson & Co, Liverpool
 HENGLER, FREDERICK CHARLES, Fitzjohn's avenue, Hampstead, Circus Proprietor. April 18. Lynch & Tebbay, Liverpool
 JONES, CHARLES MEERMAN, St George's rd, Hastings, Gent. May 1. Starling & Gblett, Gray's inn sq
 POLE, HARRIET, Devonshire pl, W. April 30. Markby & Co, Coleman st
 POLE, WILLIAM, Devonshire pl, W. Esq. F.R.S. April 30. Markby & Co, Coleman st
 RAVEN, ROBERT, Little Lunbir Grange, Brooklesby, Lincoln, Gent. May 23. Cartwright & Walker, Bawtry
 REDGWAY, MARY, Ryde, I.W. April 27. Fardells & Co, Ryde
 SOLARI, ANGELO ANTONIO NICOLA FRANCESCO, Ocker hill, Tipton, Stafford. May 8. Russ, King William st
 STREETON, FREDERICK, Kutawa, Assiniboia, North-West Territories, Canada, Farmer. May 1. Saxton & Morgan, Somerset st
 STOCKWELL, CHARLOTTE HELEN, Salisbury rd, Hove, Brighton. April 30. Upperton & Bacon, Brighton
 SUTCLIFFE, ELY, Barksland, Halifax, Gent. May 1. Symonds, Ripponden

WALKER, JOHN, Mattersey, Notts, Gent. May 23. Cartwright & Walker, Bawtry
 WARWICK, ROBERT BELLAMY, Stanground, Hunts, Farmer. June 1. Deacon & Son, Peterborough
 WING, WILLIAM, Market Overton, Rutland, Esq. May 15. St Barbe & Co, Delahay st, Westminster
 London Gazette.—FRIDAY, April 6.

AUSTIN, CHARLES, Crewe green, Chester, Engineer. May 28. Cooke, Crewe
 BARNWELL, MARY ANN, Melrose, Park rd, Moseley, King's Norton, Worcester. May 5. Colmore, Birmingham
 BELL, JAMES, Lower Thames st, Fish Salesman. May 12. Gush & Co, Finsbury circus
 BREKLEY, MATTHEW CHARLTON, Ponteland, Northumberland, Retired Butcher. May 14. Wilkinson & Marshall, Newcastle on Tyne
 BOWDEY, MARY ANN, Notting hill terr, Bayswater. May 21. Mayhew, Great Marlborough st
 BREWSTER, SUSANNAH, Foley st, Liverpool. May 31. Kent & Co, Liverpool
 COLLINGS, ROBERT BAKER, St John's, Worcester, Gent. May 1. Hooper, Exeter
 CONEY, WALTER JOHN, Braywick grove, nr Maidenhead, Esq. May 12. Ellis & Ellis, Delahay st
 CONDELL, AGNES, Westbourne park, Bayswater May 16. Condeall, Nunhead
 CURTIS, CHARLES, Plaitford, Wilts, Farmer. May 5. Tylee & Mortimer, Romsey
 DEW, MARIA LOUISA, Stockfield villas, Tysley, Worcester. May 5. Colmore, Birmingham
 DOUGHERTY, CATHERINE, North Walsham, Norfolk. June 30. Wilkinson, North Walsham
 FOWKE, THOMAS EDWARD, Stafford, Chemist and Druggist. May 3. Morgan & Co, Stafford
 FREEMAN, WILLIAM, Ipswich, Yeoman. May 15. Westhorp, Ipswich
 FREY, JULIA, Camden rd, Bath. June 24. Rutter & Rutter, Shaftesbury
 GARNETT, WILLIAM, Lucan House, nr Ripon, Esq. May 1. Taylor & Co, Bradford
 GREEN, JAMES, Mayfield rd, Dalston, Gent. May 30. Naanton & Son, Cheap-side
 HOWARD, THOMAS, Elton, nr Bury, Lancaster, Farmer. April 16. Butcher, Bury
 LAW, HENRY PATTEN, Royal Regiment of Scots Fusiliers. June 23. Elwell, Highworth, Wilts
 LOWE, CHRISTOPHER JOHN, Maidstone terr, Greenwich, Gent. May 18. Lowes, Moody, JOHN, North Searle, Lincoln, Farmer. May 15. Faulkner, Newark
 MUDGE, EDWARD, West st, Southampton, Tinsmith. May 5. Pearce & Co, Northwick, Lord, Right Hon. GEORGE, Northwick park, Worcester. May 10. Currier & Co, Worcester
 SMALLEY, WILLIAM EDWARD, Rhyll, Bank Manager. April 23. Roberts, Rhyll
 WESTLEY, FRANCIS, Exning, Suffolk, Farmer. May 1. Fenn & Co, Newmarket

BANKRUPTCY NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, April 6.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BARBER, JAMES, Newcastle on Tyne, Licensed Victualler Newcastle on Tyne Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 BARROW, ALBERT, Lewes, Coal Merchant Lewes and Eastbourne Pet April 3 Ord April 3
 BARTON, HENRY, Buglawton, nr Congleton, Silk Throwster Macclesfield Pet March 17 Ord March 29
 BREE, LEONARD MORSE, London Bridge, Hotel Keeper High Court Pet March 1 Ord March 30
 BROOK, JAMES SWIFT, Thornton, Yorks, Brewers' Traveller Bradford Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 CARPENTER, WILLIAM, Llanelly, Florist Carmarthen Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 COOKSON, CHARLES GEORGE, address unknown High Court Pet Sept 1 Ord March 6
 CORNELL, WILLIAM EDWARD, Churchfield rd, Acton Leather Sellers' Manager Brentford Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 DAVIES, DAVID, Llandovery, Carmarthen, Boot Maker Carmarthen Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 ENNES, SAMUEL, Stockwell green, Stockwell, Traveller High Court Pet March 29 Ord March 29
 EVANS, THOMAS, Llanganten, Brecon, Farmer Newtown Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 FOWLER, FRANCIS WILLIAM, Swaffham, Norfolk, Butcher King's Lynn Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 GORNALL, JOHN, Thornton in Lonsdale, Yorks, Innkeeper Kendal Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 GREATWOOD, ALBERT JOHN, Birmingham, out of business Birmingham Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 HAYTEL, GEORGE EDWARD, Melkham, Wilts, Plumber Bath Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 HUDSON, WILLIAM MURRELL, South Shields, Contractor Newcastle on Tyne Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 JONES, ALFRED, Birmingham, Builder Birmingham Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 JONES, THOMAS, Martley, Worcestershire, Tailor Worcester Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 LONDON, JESSE WILLIAM, Aylesbury, Carpenter Aylesbury Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 LE MAY, F. T., Huntingdon terr, Green lanes, Wood Green, Grocer Edmonton Pet March 7 Ord March 27
 MOLLON, JAMES, Favenham, Bedfordshire, Farmer Bedford Pet March 31 Ord March 31
 PARRY, THOMAS, Littledean, Gloucestershire, Shopkeeper Gloucester Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 REEVES, EDWARD, Stockbridge, Hampshire, Coal Merchant Southampton April 4 Ord April 4
 REDMAN, ALFRED, jun., Bullen rd, Clapham Junction, out of business Wandsworth Pet March 29 Ord March 29
 RICHARDS, JESSE, Frome, Baker Frome Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 ROBINSON, JOHN, Sleaford, Lincolnshire, Draper Boston Pet March 21 Ord April 4
 SOCHATSKEW, HARRIS, Commercial st, Confectioner High Court Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 SUMMERHAYES, WILLIAM FRANK, New Broad st, Solicitor High Court Pet Feb 21 Ord March 29
 WALLIS, FREDERICK LOCKYER, Canterbury, Hosier Canterbury Pet April 4 Ord April 4

FIRST MEETINGS.

ANDREWS, THOMAS, Bockleton, Worcestershire, Farmer April 15 at 2.15 A. G. Hooper, Solicitor, Kidderminster

BACON, WALTER HENRY, Bath pl, Kensington, Fine Art Publisher April 13 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Lincoln's inn
 BARRER, JAMES, Newcastle on Tyne, Licensed Victualler April 18 at 3 Off Rec, Pink lane, Newcastle on Tyne
 PARTON, HENRY, Buglawton, nr Congleton, Silk Throwster April 13 at 11 Off Rec, 28, King Edward st, Macclesfield
 BUTT, GEORGE ROBERT, King's Head ct, Barbican, Furrier April 13 at 2.30 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
 CHARTER, GEORGE WILLIAM, Westbourne rd, Barnsbury, Biscuit Manufacturer April 13 at 11 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
 COLEMAN, STEPHEN JOHNSON, Lewisham, Commercial Traveller April 13 at 3 109, Victoria st, Westminster
 DOWKING, JACOB, Old Hill, Staffordshire, Teacher of Music April 17 at 10.30 Off Rec, Dudley
 FRANKHAM, CHARLES JEREMIAH, Chipping Sodbury, Gloucestershire, Baker April 13 at 12 Bank chhrs, Bristol
 HALL, WHITWELL, Bridlington, Yorks, Grocer April 16 at 11.20 Off Rec, 74, Newborough st, Scarborough
 HARNETT JAMES BRICE, Herne Bay, Victualler April 13 at 9.30 47, St George's st, Canterbury
 HOBSON, ALFRED, Tipton, Grocer April 17 at 10 Off Rec, Dudley
 HODGES, JOHN, Willenhall, Staffordshire, Licensed Victualler April 14 at 12 Off Rec, St Peter's close, Wolverhampton
 HOUNSELL, BERNARD WILMSHURST, Farringdon st, Journalist April 13 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Lincoln's inn
 HUDSON, WILLIAM MURRELL, South Shields, Contractor April 13 at 11 Off Rec, Pink lane, Newcastle on Tyne
 JONES, THOMAS H, Colebrook ter, Islington, Gent April 13 at 12 33, Carey st Lincoln's inn
 JONES, THOMAS, Martley, Worcester, Tailor April 17 at 11 Off Rec, Worcester
 LAYER, HENRY, Anerley, out of business April 13 at 12 109, Victoria st, Westminster
 MACMORRAN, WILLIAM, Sheffield, Draper April 16 at 3 Off Rec, Figtree lane, Sheffield
 MILLWARD, GEORGE, Redditch, Fishmonger April 17 at 11 25, Colmore row, Birmingham
 MOON, JOHN SHEFFIELD, Gt Grimsby, Shoemaker April 13 at 12 Off Rec, 3, Haven st, Gt Grimsby
 NEWTON, FORD PRESTON, Norton, nr Malton, Yorks, Horse Dealer April 13 at 11.30 Talbot Hotel, Malton
 POOL, JAMES, Bilton, Staffs, Butcher April 14 at 11 Off Rec, St Peter's close, Wolverhampton
 PRATT, WILLIAM DUKE, Chaddeley Corbet, Worcester, Saddler April 13 at 2 A G Hooper, solo, Kidderminster
 PUGH, WILLIAM PLATTIS, and EDWARD PUGH, Queen Victoria st, Engravers April 13 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Lincoln's inn
 RICHARDSON, JOHN, West Hartlepool, Landowner April 13 at 4 Royal Hotel, West Hartlepool
 SMETHURST, WYLIAM, Nottingham, Engineer April 14 at 12 Off Rec, 1, High pavement, Nottingham
 TAYLOR, EDWARD, Birmingham, Grocer April 20 at 11 25, Colmore row, Birmingham

ADJUDICATIONS.

ANDREWS, THOMAS, Bockleton, Worcestershire, Farmer Kidderminster Pet Feb 24 Ord April 4
 BARROW, ALBERT, Lewes, Sussex, Coal Merchant Lewes and Eastbourne Pet April 3 Ord April 3
 BOSWELL, CORNELIUS JELLY, jun, Enfield, Builder Edmonton Pet March 2 Ord March 29
 CARPENTER, WILLIAM, Llanelly, Florist Carmarthen Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 COCKBAIN, JOHN, Penrith, Wine Merchant Carlisle Pet March 29 Ord April 3
 COTTON, THOMAS, Boston, Lincolns, Clothier Boston Pet March 6 Ord April 4
 DAVIES, DAVID, Llandoverly, Carmarthenshire, Boot maker Carmarthen Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 DREWITT, WILLIAM, Horsham, Coal Merchant Brighton Pet March 9 Ord April 4
 GORNALL, JOHN, Thornton in Lonsdale, Innkeeper Kendal Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 HAYTER, GEORGE EDWARD, Melksham, Wilts, Plumber Bath Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 HERBERT, WILLIAM, Manchester rd, Cubitt Town, Grocer High Court Pet March 27 Ord March 29
 HUDSON, WILLIAM MURRELL, South Shields, Contractor Newcastle on Tyne Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 JACKSON, JOHN UPTON, Sheffield, Tailor Sheffield Pet Aug 22 Ord March 29
 JONES, ALFRED, Birmingham, Builder Birmingham Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 JONES, THOMAS, Martley, Worcestershire, Tailor Worcester Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 LANGLEY, WILLIAM, Shoreham, Grocer Brighton Pet March 23 Ord April 4
 LEWIS, ANNIE, Rhayader, Radnorshire, Grocer Newtown Pet March 19 Ord April 4
 MORGAN, WILLIAM, Abertillery, Mon, Grocer Tredegar Pet March 27 Ord April 4
 REEVES, EDWARD, Stockbridge, Hampshire, Coal Merchant Southampton Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 RICHARDS, JESSE, Frome, Baker Frome Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 RIDEAL, CHARLES FREDERICK, Woburn pl, Clerk High Court Pet Feb 20 Ord March 29
 STEVENSON, JOHN, and JAMES STEVENSON, Old Compton st, Soho, Bakers High Court Pet March 7 Ord March 29
 WARNER, GEORGE, New rd, Battersea Park rd, Eclectic Practitioner Wandsworth Pet March 26 Ord March 29
 WILKINSON, FREDERICK, Holloway rd, Cheesemonger High Court Pet March 28 Ord March 29

ADJUDICATION ANNULLED.

SANDYS, Hon EDMUND ARTHUR MARCUS, Chesham st, S W. High Court Adjud March 18 Annul March 27

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, April 10.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BARRY, ROSENA, King's heath, Worcester, Shot Belt Manufacturer Birmingham Pet April 6 Ord April 6
 BECKTON, WALTER JOHN, Wakehurst rd, Clapham Junction, Commercial Traveller High Court Pet April 7 Ord April 7
 BILTON, SAMUEL FALLOWS, Pentford st, Camberwell, Clerk High Court Pet April 6 Ord April 6
 BOLZEE, THOMAS, Bledington, Glos, out of business Cheltenham Pet March 23 Ord April 5
 BOND, WILLIAM HENRY, Lee, Kent, no occupation Greenwich Pet April 6 Ord April 6
 BRIGHTON, GEORGE WILLIAM, and WILLIAM ERNEST BRIGHTON, Petherton rd, Canonbury, Poultry Dealers High Court Pet April 6 Ord April 6

BROADBENT, JOHN, Ryde, Cheshire, Hat Manufacturer Ashton under Lyne and Stalybridge Pet April 6 Ord April 6
 CHAPMAN, HENRY, Weelsby, Lincs, Fishing Vessel Owner Gt Grimsby Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 CHARNOCK, JONATHAN, Tyersal, nr Bradford, Manufacturer Bradford Pet April 7 Ord April 7
 CONNOR, FRANK, Littlehampton, Sussex, Grocer Brighton Pet April 5 Ord April 5
 CORCORAN, JAMES, PETER CORCORAN, and CHARLES CORCORAN, Chorlton on Medlock, Manchester, Masons Manchester Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 CROSHER, RICHARD, Leicester, late Hop Merchant Leicester Pet April 6 Ord April 6
 EDWARDS, ISAAC NEWTON, St Albans, Farmer High Court Pet April 6 Ord April 6
 EVANS, JOSEPH H, Ware, Herts Hertford Pet March 22 Ord April 7
 EXLEY, THOMAS, Pudsey, nr Leeds, lately Tanner Leeds Pet March 20 Ord April 6
 FUSSELL, WILLIAM HENRY, Beckington, Somersetshire, Baker Frome Pet April 7 Ord April 7
 GALLIPI, JOHN ANDREW, Gt Grimsby, Ship Chandler Gt Grimsby Pet March 21 Ord April 4
 GOLDSMITH, THOMAS BOROUGH, Ella rd, Crouch hill, Insurance Agent High Court Pet April 6 Ord April 6
 GRAVES, CHARLES, Liverpool, Commercial Traveller Liverpool Pet March 23 Ord April 6
 HALLIGNEY, MARY, and ALFRED CECIL HALLIGNEY, Falmouth, Builders Truro Pet April 5 Ord April 5
 HARRIS, REUBEN, Blackheath, Staffordshire, Bricklayer Stourbridge Pet March 29 Ord March 29
 HARRIS, WILLIAM HOLDEN, Liverpool, Solicitor Liverpool Pet March 28 Ord April 7
 HEARD, JOHN, sen, Sudbury, Suffolk, General Dealer Colchester Pet March 21 Ord April 6
 HECKELS, GEORGE, North Shields, Boat Builder Newcastle on Tyne Pet March 23 Ord April 5
 HERBOD, WALTER, Nottingham, Corn Merchant Nottingham Pet March 21 Ord April 6
 HILL, CHARLES, Alstonfield, Staffordshire, Farmer Macclesfield Pet April 6 Ord April 6
 HODGE, EDWARD, Crewkerne, Somersetshire, Draper Yeovil Pet April 6 Ord April 6
 JACOBS, BENJAMIN, Sheffield, Financial Agent Sheffield Pet March 15 Ord April 5
 JACKSON, ANDREW, Manchester, out of business Manchester Pet April 5 Ord April 5
 JENKIN, SAMUEL JOHN, Truro, Boot Dealer Truro Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 JOHNSON, EDWIE, and JEREMIAH BEBB, Bristol, Lamp Merchants Bristol Pet April 5 Ord April 6
 JONES, RICHARD DAVIES, Ashton on Mersey, Cheshire, Beer Retailer Manchester Pet April 6 Ord April 6
 KAY, JOHN, Crayford, Kent, Assistant Clerk Rochester Pet April 7 Ord April 7
 KEY, DAVID THOMAS, Edith villas, West Kensington, Surgeon High Court Pet March 17 Ord April 6
 LAWSON, THOMAS, Wigan, Colliery Bankman Wigan Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 LISTER, BENJAMIN, Huby, Yorks, Innkeeper York Pet April 7 Ord April 7
 LOCKWOOD, JOHN, Barrow on Soar, Leicester, Grocer Leicester Pet April 5 Ord April 5
 MASTERMAN, GEORGE, Castleford, Yorks, Bill Poster Wakefield Pet April 6 Ord April 6
 MERCHANT, WILLIAM, Portland rd, South Norwood, Builder Croydon Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 METCALFE, WILLIAM, Holderness, Yorks, Farmer Kingston upon Hull Pet April 6 Ord April 6
 MILLS, JOHN, Selston, Notts, Licensed Victualler Derby Pet April 5 Ord April 5
 PARKINSON, WILLIAM JAMES, Liverpool, Provision Merchant Preston Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 PERKE, GEORGE, Tonbridge, Kent, Nurseryman Tunbridge Wells Pet April 7 Ord April 7
 PETERS, IREAS, Aberystwyth, Boot Maker Aberystwyth Pet April 5 Ord April 5
 POWER, HENRY D'ARCY, East Dulwich rd, Physician High Court Ord March 24
 ROBERTS, BENJAMIN, Knowbury, Salop, Farmer Leominster Pet March 19 Ord April 5
 ROEBUCK, JONATHAN, Lepton, Yorks, Innkeeper Huddersfield Pet April 6 Ord April 6
 ROTHCHILD, T., Jefferies sq, St Mary Axe High Court Pet March 13 Ord April 5
 ROWE, SAMUEL, Cartmel, Lancashire, Innkeeper Ulverston and Barrow in Furness Pet April 6 Ord April 6
 RYMER, RICHARD, Bristol, Builder Bath Pet April 7 Ord April 7
 SANDERS, ELIZABETH, Penryn, Cornwall, Grocer Truro Pet March 23 Ord April 4
 SEDGWICK, HENRY, Nottingham, Joiner Nottingham Pet April 5 Ord April 5
 SHIPLEY, SAMUEL, Epworth, Lincolnshire, Corn Factor Sheffield Pet March 10 Ord April 5
 SMITH, ARTHUR WILLIAM, Liverpool, Estate Agent Liverpool Pet Oct 3 Ord April 6
 SMITH, ROBERT SKILLETER, Reading, Builder Reading Pet March 29 Ord March 29
 SOMERVALE, JAMES THOMPSON, and FREDERICK GEORGE LOWE, Tooley st, Southwark, Provision Agents High Court Pet March 20 Ord April 5
 STRICKLAND, MARIANNE, Forest Hill, Kent, Proprietress of Ladies' School York Pet April 6 Ord April 6
 THOMAS, LLEWELLYN, Cardiff, Builder Cardiff Pet April 5 Ord April 5
 TURNER, H H, Beaconsfield ter, Kensington, Dairyman High Court Pet Feb 25 Ord April 5
 WADE, JAMES, Nottingham, Builder Nottingham Pet April 5 Ord April 5
 WASSILL, ERNEST ARTHUR, Brighton, China Merchant Brighton Pet March 21 Ord April 4
 WEBBER, B K, Sheffield, Joiner Sheffield Pet March 11 Ord April 5
 WILLIAMS, SAMUEL BRANTON, Cardiff, Beerhouse Manager Cardiff Pet April 5 Ord April 5
 WILLIAMS, W H, & Co, Queen Victoria st, Picture Dealers High Court Pet March 13 Ord April 5
 YORK, GEORGE, and WALTER JOHN TRISTRUM, Stanhope st, Euston rd, Saw Mill Proprietors High Court Pet April 6 Ord April 6

FIRST MEETINGS.

ASHBY, EDGAR OSBORNE, Hastings April 19 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn
 ATKINSON, GEORGE FRENLEY, Snaith, Yorks, [Physician] April 18 at 12 Downe Arms Hotel, Snaith

BEAL, JAMES, Jun, Brighton, Furniture Dealer April 17 at 11.30 Off Rec, 4, Pavilion bldgs, Brighton
 BONE, JOHN, Luton, Hat Manufacturer April 18 at 3 Off Rec, Park st West, Luton
 BROOK, JAMES SWIFT, Thornton, Yorks, Brewers' Traveller April 18 at 12 Off Rec, 31, Manor row, Bradford
 BURCHARD, EDWARD CHRISTIAN, Chalk Farm rd, Oilman April 17 at 11 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
 BUCKWELL, THOMAS DOUGLAS, Burgess Hill, Sussex, out of business April 18 at 12 Off Rec, 4, Pavilion bldgs, Brighton
 CARPENTER, WILLIAM, Llanelli, Florist April 18 at 11 Off Rec, Carmarthen
 COOPER, SEPTIMUS, Piccadilly, Brush Manufacturer April 17 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn
 CORLESS, WILLIAM, Barrow in Furness, Boerseller April 18 at 10.30 2, Paxton ter, Barrow in Furness
 CRAGE, WILLIAM ANANIAS, St Mary at Hill, Fish Factor April 17 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
 DAVIES, DAVID, Llandovery, Boot Maker April 18 at 3 Off Rec, Carmarthen
 EVANS, THOMAS, Llanganten, Breconshire, Farmer April 18 at 1 Off Rec, Llanidloes
 FOULKES, WILLIAM TADMAN, Birmingham, Architect April 23 at 11 25, Colmore row, Birmingham
 GREEN, JOHN, Stafrfoot, nr Barnsley, Yorks, Draper April 18 at 2 Off Rec, Figtree lane, Sheffield
 GURSON, SAMUEL YATES, Birkenhead, out of business April 18 at 2 Off Rec, 48, Hamilton sq, Birkenhead
 HAYTER, GEORGE EDWARD, Melksham, Wilts, Plumber April 18 at 12.45 Bank chmbrs, Bristol
 HEARD, JOHN, sen, Sudbury, Suffolk, General Dealer April 21 at 11 Townhall, Colchester
 HECKELS, GEORGE, North Shields, Boat Builder April 19 at 2 Off Rec, Pink lane, Newcastle on Tyne
 HINDLE, ALEXANDER, Barrow in Furness, Iron Plate Worker April 18 at 11.30 2, Paxton ter, Barrow in Furness
 HUBBLE, JOHN, Well st, Mare st, Hackney, Leather Merchant Apr 19 at 11 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
 HUGGINS, WILLIAM ALFRED, Beckenham rd, Penge, Dairyman April 19 at 3 109, Victoria st, Westminster
 JAMES, WILLIAM HENRY, Birmingham, Tailor Apr 20 at 3 25, Colmore row, Birmingham
 JENKIN, SAMUEL JOHN, Truro, Boot Dealer Apr 17 at 1 Off Rec, Boscawen st, Truro
 JENKINS, ANN, Borroughbridge, Somerset, Licensed Victualler Apr 18 at 11 Bristol Arms Hotel, Bridgwater
 JOHNSON, EDWIN, and JEREMIAH BEBB, Bristol, Lamp Merchants Apr 23 at 12.30 Bank chmbrs, Bristol
 KAY, JOHN, Crayford, Kent, Clerk Apr 21 at 11.30 Off Rec, High st, Rochester
 LAWSON, THOMAS, Wigan, Colliery Bankman Apr 24 at 10.45 Wigan County Court
 LEWIS, WILLIAM, Bedwas, Mon, Colliery Proprietor Apr 18 at 1 Off Rec, 12, Tredegar pl, Newport, Mon
 LISTER, BENJAMIN, Huby, Yorks, Innkeeper Apr 20 at 1 Off Rec, York
 MIDDLEBY, ABRAHAM, Bingley, Yorks, Manufacturer April 18 at 11 Off Rec, 31, Manor rd, Bradford
 MILES, WILLIAM, Worthing, Auctioneer April 18 at 2 Dolphin Hotel, Chichester
 MILLS, JOHN, Selston, Nottinghamshire, Licensed Victualler April 19 at 2.30 Off Rec, St James's Chambers, Derby
 MITCHINSON, JAMES, Chapel st, Edgware rd, Furniture Dealer April 18 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
 MORGAN, FREDERICK PROSSER, Bristol, Cabinet Maker April 18 at 12 Bank chmbrs, Bristol
 MORGAN, WILLIAM, Aberdillery, Mon, Grocer April 19 at 12.15 Off Rec, 12, Tredegar pl, Newport
 MURFORD, ISABEL MARIA VICTORIA, Conduit st, Regent st, Court Milliner April 17 at 12 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
 MUSSON, WILLIAM, and GEORGE MUSSON, Bromley, Grocers April 18 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
 PARRY, THOMAS, Littledean, Gloucestershire, Shopkeeper April 17 at 2.30 Off Rec, 16, King st, Gloucester
 PEARCE, ALFRED, Hampstead, Baker April 18 at 11 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn
 PLESTED, HENRY, Wandsworth rd, Clapham, Provision Dealer April 19 at 4 109, Victoria st, Westminster
 REDSHAW, JOSEPH HAY, Barrow in Furness, Clerk April 18 at 12.30 2, Paxton ter, Barrow in Furness
 REEVES, EDWARD, Stockbridge, Hampshire, Coal Merchant April 20 at 11.30 Off Rec, 4, East st, Gloucester
 RICHARDS, JESSE, Frome, Baker April 19 at 1.15 Bank chmbrs, Bristol
 ROEBUCK, JONATHAN, Lepton, Yorks, Innkeeper April 20 at 3 Haigh & Son, Solicitors, New st, Huddersfield
 SANDERS, ELIZABETH, Penryn, Cornwall, Grocer April 17 at 12 Off Rec, Boscawen st, Truro
 SLOCOMBE, FREDERICK, Leeds, out of business April 20 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Lincoln's inn
 SMITH, JAMES EDWARD, Essex rd, Islington, Decorator April 19 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Lincoln's inn
 STRICKLAND, MARIANNE, York, Proprietress of Ladies' School April 20 at 2 Off Rec, York
 SUMMERHAY, WILLIAM FRANK, New Broad st, Solicitor April 17 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
 SWADLING, GEORGE, Thame, Oxford, Grocer April 18 at 11.30 1, St Aldate's, Oxford
 THOMAS, JOHN EDMUND, Wrexham, Surveyor April 18 at 3.30 Wynnstay Hotel, Wrexham
 VAN MENTZ, ABRAHAM, Charterhouse st, Merchant April 17 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields
 WINDIBANK, EDWARD T, Selhurst rd, Upper Norwood, Watchmaker April 19 at 12 109, Victoria st, Westminster
 WRIGHT, DAVID, Leamington, Livery Stable Keeper April 18 at 11 C I Blaker, Solicitor, Church st, Leamington
 WRIGHT, ELIZA, Eastbourne, Widow April 18 at 3 Off Rec, 4, Pavilion bldgs, Brighton

ADJUDICATIONS.
 BALDWIN, JOHN, King's Langley, Hertfordshire, Builder St Albans Pet March 6 Ord April 5
 BARRE, JAMES, Newcastle on Tyne, Licensed Victualler Newcastle on Tyne Pet April 4 Ord April 7
 BOND, WILLIAM HENRY, Lee, Kent, no occupation Greenwich Pet April 5 Ord April 6
 BONE, JOHN, Luton, Straw Hat Manufacturer Luton Pet March 8 Ord April 7
 BUCKNALL, S. C. LINDSEY, Maidenhead Windsor Pet Jan 37 Ord April 4
 CHAPMAN, HENRY, Weelsby, Lincolnshire, Fishing Vessel Owner Great Grimsby Pet April 4 Ord April 4
 CONNOR, FRANK, Littlehampton, Sussex, Grocer Brighton Pet April 4 Ord April 5

CORNELL, WILLIAM EDWARD, Churchfield rd, Acton, Leather Sellers' Manager Brentford Pet April 4 Ord April 6
 CROSBY, JOHN, Sunderland, Brewery Manager Sunderland Pet March 18 Ord March 29
 ELLACOTT, EDWARD, Mandrake rd, Upper Tooting, Builder Wandsworth Pet March 8 Ord April 5
 FERKDAY, JOHN WHITE, Wednesbury, Surveyor Walsall Pet March 14 Ord April 5
 FOULKES, WILLIAM TADMAN, Birmingham, Architect Birmingham Pet March 15 Ord April 6
 FRANKHAM, CHARLES JEREMIAH, Sodbury, Glos, Baker Bristol Pet March 29 Ord April 5
 GALLINI, JOHN ANDREW, Gt Grimsby, Ship Chandler Gt Grimsby Pet March 30 Ord April 4
 JENKIN, SAMUEL JOHN, Truro, Boot Dealer Truro Pet April 4 Ord April 5
 HALLITT, HENRY, Parkstone, Dorset, Wheelwright Poole Pet March 23 Ord April 4
 HALLIGREY, MARY, and ALFRED CECIL HALLIGREY, Falmouth, Builders Truro Pet April 5 Ord April 5
 HARRIS, REUBEN, Blackheath, Staffs, Bricklayer Stourbridge Pet March 29 Ord April 5
 HUTCHINSON, ANN, Newcastle on Tyne, out of business Newcastle on Tyne Pet March 29 Ord April 5
 JACKSON, ANDREW, Manchester, out of business Manchester Pet April 5 Ord April 5
 JONES, RICHARD DAVIES, Ashton on Mersey, Beer Retailer Manchester Pet April 6 Ord April 6
 KAY, JOHN, Crayford, Kent, Clerk Rochester Pet April 7 Ord April 7
 KEY, DAVID THOMAS, West Kensington, Surgeon High Court Pet March 17 Ord April 7
 LOCKWOOD, JOHN, Barrow on Soar, Leicestershire, Grocer Leicester Pet April 5 Ord April 5
 LOUGHLIN, MICHAEL, Bemerton st, Caledonian rd, Rag Merchant High Court Pet March 29 Ord April 5
 LAWSON, THOMAS, Wigan, Colliery Bankman Wigan Pet April 4 Ord April 7
 LASTER, BENJAMIN, Huby, Yorks, Innkeeper York Pet April 7 Ord April 7
 MADDOCK, EMILY, Wellington, Salop, Bootdealer Madeley, Shropshire Pet Feb 27 Ord April 4
 MASTERMAN, GEORGE, Castleford, Yorks, Bill Poster Wakefield Pet April 6 Ord April 6
 MCMORRAN, WILLIAM, Sheffield, Draper Sheffield Pet March 13 Ord April 5
 METCALFE, WILLIAM, Holderness, Yorks, Farmer Kingston upon Hull Pet April 6 Ord April 6
 MOVBRAY, SAMUEL HINCHOLIFFE, Saddleworth, Yorks, Postmaster Oldham Pet March 19 Ord April 6
 PEACE, ALFRED, Rye lane, Peckham High Court Pet Feb 8 Ord April 6
 PARRY, THOMAS, Littledean, Glos, Shopkeeper Gloucester Pet April 4 Ord April 7
 PEEK, GEORGE, Tonbridge, Kent, Nurseryman Tunbridge Wells Pet April 6 Ord April 7
 PHILLIPS, THOMAS, Ilfracombe, Devon, Fish Salesman Barnstaple Pet March 19 Ord April 5
 POOL, JAMES, Bileston, Staffs, Butcher Wolverhampton Pet March 19 Ord April 6
 RAMPLING, WILLIAM, Wimborne, Dorsetshire, Manager of Gasworks Poole Pet March 7 Ord April 4
 REDMAN, ALFRED, Jun, St John's hill, Clapham Junction, out of business Wandsworth Pet March 29 Ord April 5
 RHODES, THOMAS WILLIAM, Charnock Hall, nr Gleadless, Derbyshire, Gent Chesterfield Pet Feb 9 Ord April 4
 ROEBUCK, JONATHAN, Lepton, Yorks, Innkeeper Huddersfield Pet April 6 Ord April 6
 ROWE, SAMUEL, Cartmel, Lancs, Innkeeper Ulverston and Barrow in Furness Pet April 6 Ord April 6
 SALISBURY, THOMAS, Wells, Commercial Traveller Wells Pet Mar 26 Ord Apr 6
 SANDERS, ELIZABETH, Penryn, Cornwall, Grocer Truro Pet Mar 22 Ord Apr 7
 SEDGWICK, HENRY, Nottingham, Joiner Nottingham Pet Apr 5 Ord Apr 7
 SWADLING, GEORGE, Thame, Grocer Aylesbury Pet Mar 14 Ord Apr 5
 TAYLOR, J O R, Albemarle st, Gent High Court Pet Dec 9 Ord Apr 4
 TURNER, FREDERICK JOHN, Shepton Mallett, Licensed Victualler Wells Pet Mar 13 Ord Apr 5
 WADE, JAMES, Nottingham, Builder Nottingham Pet Apr 5 Ord Apr 7
 WILLIAMS, SAMUEL BRANTON, Cardiff, Beerhouse Manager Cardiff Pet Apr 5 Ord Apr 6
 WILSON, HENRY, Albert rd, South Norwood, Gent Croydon Pet Mar 28 Ord Apr 5
 WINDIBANK, EDWARD T, Sydenham rd, Selhurst rd, Upper Norwood, Watchmaker Croydon Pet Feb 23 Ord Apr 6

SALE OF ENSUING WEEK.

April 19.—Messrs. GLASIER & SONS at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Absolute Reversion (see advertisement, April 7, p. 378).

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTH.

BURGESS.—April 9, at Queensberry-place, S.W., the wife of Henry Edward Burgess, of a son.

DEATH.

JANEWAY.—April 10, at Kingswood House, Gauden-road, Clapham, Caroline, the wife of William Janeway, of 38, Bedford-row, London, solicitor. The interment will take place at Norwood Cemetery on Saturday, April 14, at 3.30 p.m.

CONTENTS.

CURRENT TOPICS.....	379	NEW ORDERS, &c.....	396
A NOVEL EXPERIMENT IN LITIGATION.....	381	LEGAL NEWS.....	397
THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BILL.....	381	COURT PAPERS.....	397
CORRESPONDENCE.....	383	WINDING-UP NOTICES.....	390
LAW SOCIETIES.....	386	CREDITORS' NOTICES.....	391
LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.....	385	BANKRUPTCY NOTICES.....	391

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

FIRE!! BURGLARS!! JOHN TANN'S

"ANCHOR RELIANCE"
SAFES
FOR JEWELLERY, PLATE, DEEDS, BOOKS, &c.
SOLICITORS' DEED BOXES.

FIRE RESISTING SAFES, £4 10s., £5 5s., and £8 5s.

LISTS FREE.

11, NEWGATE ST., LONDON, E.C.

PROVIDENT LIFE OFFICE,
50, REGENT STREET, LONDON, W.
Abstract of Annual and Quinquennial Report of the Directors, 17th February, 1888.

Proposals were received for New Assurances amounting to £539,861. Of these 954 were accepted, and Policies granted for £462,263, the annual Premiums upon which were £16,019; these figures show an increase upon the year 1886 of 101 in the number of Policies issued, £76,683 in the amount assured, and £2,449 in the new annual Premiums.

Proposals for £77,698 were declined or not completed.

The Claims for the year were £230,278, an increase of £10,070 upon the amount for 1886.

The Annual Income is now £219,719. The total funds at the close of the year were £2,501,299, an increase of £15,344.

On the 31st of December last was completed another Quinquennial period, and in accordance with the terms of the 54th Clause of the Deed of Constitution, a Valuation of the Liabilities under all Policies of Assurance has been made by the Actuary.

The Valuation of the Assets and Liabilities results in a surplus of £451,123 4s. 4d., yielding, after setting aside the ample reserve provided for under the Deed of Constitution, £6,804 18s. to the Shareholders; while the reversionary value of £218,754 14s. 3d. will be allotted to the various Policies entitled to Bonus.

KINNAIRD, Chairman.

IMPERIAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Established 1803.

1, Old Broad-street, E.C., and 22, Pall Mall, S.W.

Subscribed Capital, £1,200,000; Paid-up, £300,000.

Total Invested Funds over £1,600,000.

E. COZENS SMITH,

General Manager.

EDE AND SON,

ROBE  MAKERS,

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,
To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of
the Judicial Bench, Corporation of London, &c.

ROBES FOR QUEEN'S COUNSEL AND BARRISTERS.
SOLICITORS' GOWNS.

Law Wigs and Gowns for Registrars, Town Clerks,
and Clerks of the Peace.

CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY AND CLERGY GOWNS.
ESTABLISHED 1689.

94 CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

THE UNION DEBENTURE COMPANY, LIMITED.

CHARLES SEYMOUR GREENFELL, Esq., Chairman.
LEWIS H. ISAACS, Esq., M.P., Deputy-Chairman.
This Company is prepared to receive from Companies and Firms proposals for the undermentioned classes of business, which will bear the strictest investigation:

The Public Issue of Debentures or Share Capital; Underwriting and Subscribing for New Issues; the Advance of Money Secured on Approved Assets.

Solicitors, Stockbrokers, and Accountants would find this Company a good medium for the purpose of carrying out the wishes of clients desirous of obtaining Capital on the lines above indicated.

All proposals promptly dealt with.

JOHN FILBY, Secretary.
11, St. Helen's-place, Bishopsgate-st., London, E.C.

REVERSIONARY and LIFE INTERESTS IN LANDED or FUNDED PROPERTY or other Securities and Annuities PURCHASED, or Loans or Annuities thereon granted, by the **EQUITABLE REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY (LIMITED)**, 10, Lancaster-place, Waterloo Bridge, Strand. Established 1835. Capital, £200,000. Interest on Loans may be capitalized.

F. S. CLAYTON, } Joint
C. H. CLAYTON, } Secretaries.

NORTHERN ASSURANCE COMPANY,

Established 1836.

LONDON: 1, Moorgate-street, E.C. ABERDEEN,
Union-terrace.

INCOME & FUNDS (1886):—

Fire Premiums	£562,000
Life Premiums	198,000
Interest	13,000
Accumulated Funds	£3,297,000

London Gazette.

Advertisements can be received at these Offices for the current Gazette without Expedition Fees until 1.15 p.m. on

Mondays and Thursdays.

GOVERNMENT EXPEDITION FEES (ON LATE ADVERTISEMENTS).

Mondays and Thursdays	to 4.15 p.m.	5s.
Tuesdays and Fridays	to 11.15 a.m.	10s.
"	"	1.15 p.m.
"	"	20s.

REYNELL & SON,

"London Gazette" and General Advertising Contractors,

44, CHANCERY LANE, W.C.

(Opposite Lincoln's Inn Gateway).

ESTABLISHED BY THE LATE GEO. REYNELL IN 1812.

THE SOCIETY OF ACCOUNTANTS and AUDITORS. (Incorporated 1885.) The Fellows and Associates of this Society practice in all parts of the United Kingdom, and are styled "Incorporated Accountants." Lists of the Members and all information may be obtained upon application to the Secretary. By order of the Council.

JAMES MARTIN, Secretary.

Office: 4, King-street, Cheapside, London, E.C.

HOME for the TREATMENT and CURE of INEBRIETY and MORPHIA HABIT. High Shot House, Twickenham. — Charming secluded. Gentlemen only. Limited number taken. Billiard room, library, lawn tennis court, bowls, &c. The whole staff pledged abstainers. Terms — 2s. to 5 guineas weekly. — Particulars from the Medical Superintendent, H. BRANTHWAITE, F.R.C.S. Ed.; and reference is permitted to Messrs. MURTON & MORRIS, Solicitors, 95A, Queen Victoria-street, London.

FURNISH your HOUSES or APARTMENTS THROUGHOUT on MOEDER'S HIRE SYSTEM.

The original, best, and most liberal.

Founded A.D. 1868.

Cash prices. No extra charge for time given. Particulars, estimates, Press opinions, testimonials, post-free.

F. MOEDER, 248, 249, and 250, Tottenham-court-road, and 19, 20, and 21, Morwell-street, W. Established 1862.

ALSO FOR HIRE ONLY

LAW UNION FIRE AND LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Established in the Year 1854.

The only Law Insurance Office in the United Kingdom which transacts both Fire and Life Insurance Business.

CHIEF OFFICE—126, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

The Funds in hand and Capital subscribed exceed the sum of £1,900,000 Sterling.

CHAIRMAN—JAMES CUDDON, Esq., of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law.

DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN—C. PEMBERTON, Esq. (Lee and Pemberton), Solicitor, 44, Lincoln's Inn-fields.

STATEMENT OF SOME OF THE ADVANTAGES OFFERED BY THE COMPANY.

Fire and Life Insurance business are both transacted; Annuities are granted, Reversions, Life Interests, &c., purchased, and Loans granted on such securities. The Rates for Fire Insurances are those prevalent amongst first-class Offices. As regards Life Insurance, special attention is drawn to the following features:—

1. The Premiums are moderate.

2. Claims are payable immediately on proof of death and title.

3. At the last division of profits in 1885 the large Reversionary Bonus of £1 10s. per centum per annum on Sums Assured and existing Bonus was declared.

This compound Bonus (i.e. Bonus upon Bonus) is exceptionally large, as will be seen from the table given below.

FOR EXAMPLE—Age 35, Sum Assured £1,000, Annual Premium £28 5s. 10d.

After years in force.	Amount of Reversionary Bonus.	Being more than	Cash Value of Bonus.	Being more than
5	£75 0 0	2½ years' prem.	£28 9 2	1 years' prem.
10	155 12 6	5½ "	66 8 9	2½ "
15	242 5 9	8½ "	116 8 0	4 "
20	326 9 1	11½ "	180 1 7	6 "
25	435 12 1	16½ "	280 7 5	9 "
30	543 5 4	19 "	357 18 5	12½ "

4. All Bonuses vest as soon as declared.

5. An Interim Bonus of £1 per centum per annum on the sum assured is paid in event of death during currency of any quinquennium. Non-forfeitable and unconditional Policies are granted.

Prospectuses and every information may be obtained from

Endowment Insurance Policies, combining Life Insurance with Investment for middle or old age, are granted, participating in the profits on the same footing as Whole Life Policies. Insurances granted against the contingency of Issue.

FRANK MCGEDY, Actuary and Secretary.

es
es

ng

12.

nd
own
of
ted
or-
the

7.

RM
RT.
ngly
sen.
&c.
to 5
tical
and
RIS,

RT-

ials,

court-
stab-

1.

1.

is of
sons
e, as

ment
same

/.